

April, 1994

The Classification of $SU(3)$ Modular Invariants Revisited

Terry Gannon*

*Institut des Hautes Etudes Scientifiques
91440 Bures-sur-Yvette, France*

Abstract

The $SU(3)$ modular invariant partition functions were first completely classified in Ref. [9]. The purpose of these notes is four-fold:

- (i) Here we accomplish the $SU(3)$ classification using only the most basic facts: modular invariance; $M_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq}$; and $M_{00} = 1$. In [9] we made use of less elementary results from Moore-Seiberg, in addition to these 3 basic facts.
- (ii) Ref. [9] was completed well over a year ago. Since then I have found a number of significant simplifications to the general argument. They are all included here.
- (iii) A number of people have complained that some of the arguments in [9] were hard to follow. I have tried here to be as explicit and as clear as possible.
- (iv) Hidden in [9] were a number of smaller results which should be of independent value. These are explicitly mentioned here.

* email: gannon@ihes.fr

1. Introduction

This paper focuses exclusively on the classification of $SU(3)$ WZNW partition functions, though many of the results and techniques work in much greater generality. See [9] for the motivation for the problem.

A level k *partition function* looks like

$$Z(\tau, z_L, z_R) = \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}^k} M_{\lambda\mu} \chi_\lambda^k(\tau, z_L, 0) \chi_\mu^k(\tau, z_R, 0)^*. \quad (1.1)$$

χ_λ^k is the *normalized character* [15] of the representation of the affine Kac-Moody algebra $A_2^{(1)}$ with (horizontal) highest weight λ and level k ; it can be thought of as a complex-valued function of the Cartan subalgebra of $A_2^{(1)}$, *i.e.* a function of a complex 2-vector z and complex numbers τ, u (we will always take $u = 0$). The (finite) sum in eq.(1.1) is over the horizontal highest weights $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}^k$ of level k :

$$\mathcal{P}^k = P_{++}^{k+3} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \mid \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbf{Z}, \ 0 < \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 < k + 3\}. \quad (1.2)$$

We will always identify a weight λ with its Dynkin labels λ_1, λ_2 . The quantity $k + 3$ will appear throughout. It is called the *height* and will be denoted n .

Warning 1 These weights λ are only *pairs* (λ_1, λ_2) , not *triples* $(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. That is, they are the horizontal projections of the affine weights: λ_0 is dropped, since it is redundant once the level is known. Also, these weights are shifted by $\rho = (1, 1)$, so the ‘identity’, or ‘vacuum’, corresponds to $\lambda = \rho$, not $\lambda = (0, 0)$. For some purposes it would have been more convenient in this paper to not have shifted by ρ , but for most purposes this convention is better.

Warning 2 The characters χ in this paper will depend on a complex 2-vector z . Many people working on these problems use ‘restricted characters’, *i.e.* put $z = 0$. I believe this is a mistake, that the math really demands that z be included.

Warning 3 Reluctantly, I have decided to make some notation changes from the [9] paper. For example, to avoid confusion with the fusion coefficients I’ll let $M_{\lambda\mu}$ and not $N_{\lambda\mu}$ denote the matrix in (1.1). Also, I’ll succumb to standard convention and let n , not k' , denote the height $k + 3$.

Because (and only because) we have $z_L, z_R \neq 0$, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the partition function Z and its coefficient matrix M . We will freely identify them.

The characters χ_λ^k for fixed k define a unitary representation of the modular group $SL(2, \mathbf{Z})$. In particular:

$$\chi_\lambda^k(\tau + 1, z) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}^k} (T^{(n)})_{\lambda\mu} \chi_\mu^k(\tau, z), \quad \text{where} \quad (1.3a)$$

$$(T^{(n)})_{\lambda\mu} = e_n(-\lambda_1^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_2^2 + n) \delta_{\lambda\mu}; \quad (1.3b)$$

$$\chi_\lambda^k(-1/\tau, z/\tau) = \exp[k\pi i z^2/\tau] \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}^k} (S^{(n)})_{\lambda\mu} \chi_\mu^k(\tau, z), \quad \text{where} \quad (1.3c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (S^{(n)})_{\lambda\mu} = & \frac{-i}{\sqrt{3n}} \{ e_n(2\lambda_1\mu_1 + \lambda_1\mu_2 + \lambda_2\mu_1 + 2\lambda_2\mu_2) + e_n(\lambda_2\mu_1 - \lambda_1\mu_1 - 2\lambda_1\mu_2 - \lambda_2\mu_2) \\ & + e_n(\lambda_1\mu_2 - \lambda_1\mu_1 - 2\lambda_2\mu_1 - \lambda_2\mu_2) - e_n(-2\lambda_1\mu_2 - \lambda_1\mu_1 - \lambda_2\mu_2 - 2\lambda_2\mu_1) \\ & - e_n(2\lambda_1\mu_1 + \lambda_1\mu_2 + \lambda_2\mu_1 - \lambda_2\mu_2) - e_n(\lambda_1\mu_2 - \lambda_1\mu_1 + \lambda_2\mu_1 + 2\lambda_2\mu_2) \} \end{aligned}$$

where $e_n(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exp[\frac{-2\pi i x}{3n}]$. The matrices $T^{(n)}$ and $S^{(n)}$ are unitary and symmetric.

Our task will be to find all Z in (1.1) satisfying the following 3 properties:

(P1) *modular invariance*. This is equivalent to the matrix equations:

$$T^{(n)\dagger} M T^{(n)} = M, \quad i.e. \quad M T^{(n)} = T^{(n)} M, \quad (1.4a)$$

$$S^{(n)\dagger} M S^{(n)} = M, \quad i.e. \quad M S^{(n)} = S^{(n)} M; \quad (1.4b)$$

(P2) the coefficients $M_{\lambda\mu}$ in eq.(1.1) must be non-negative integers; and

(P3) we must have $M_{\rho\rho} = 1$, where $\rho = (1, 1)$.

We will call any modular invariant function Z of the form (1.1), an *invariant*. Z will be called *positive* if in addition each $M_{\lambda\mu} \geq 0$, and *physical* if it satisfies (P1), (P2), and (P3). Our task is to find all physical invariants for each level k . There are other properties a physically reasonable partition function should satisfy, but for a number of reasons it is preferable to limit attention to as small a number of properties as possible. *In this paper, only (P1)-(P3) will be used.*

The $SU(3)$ classification has had a fairly long history. Ref. [2] tried to understand the space of all invariants, for any $SU(N)_k$; although this approach works for $SU(2)_k$, it was too messy even for $SU(3)_k$. But this work was used by [21] to prove the $SU(3)_k$ classification for $k+3$ prime. It also led to the *parity rule*, which turned out to be so important in the $SU(3)_k$ classification – this was independently discovered in [8] and [22]. In work done simultaneously but independently of [9], Ref. [19] classified the *permutation invariants* of $SU(3)_k$ (see eq.(2.2a) below); his argument is much longer than the one given in [9] but has the advantage of not requiring fusion rules, so it should generalize more easily to other $SU(N)_k$. [22] used it, and an amazing coincidence with the Fermat curves [16], to prove the $SU(3)_k$ classification for $k+3$ coprime to 6, and for $k+3 = 2^i$ and $k+3 = 3^i$. [24] used the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equations to find all local extensions of the $SU(3)$ chiral algebra; in our language this gives the possible ρ -couplings (see Sect.4 below). But the first, and to my knowledge the only, classification of $SU(3)_k$ physical invariants for all k was given in [9]. It was done independent of – in fact oblivious to – all the above work, apart from [2] (and the $SU(3)_k$ fusion rules, calculated in [3]).

Within this context, the only thing this present paper really adds is that it accomplishes the classification using only the properties (P1)-(P3). But it also simplifies and expands out more explicitly the arguments in [9], rewriting some completely. This should make the whole argument much more accessible. It also makes explicit some results hidden inside [9]; these should be useful in other classifications – *e.g.* Claims 1 and 2 and Prop.1 are used in [13].

The 6 outer automorphisms of $A_2^{(1)}$ are generated by C (order 2) and A (order 3). These act on the horizontal weights $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathcal{P}^k$ in this way:

$$C(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (\lambda_2, \lambda_1), \quad (1.5a)$$

$$A(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (n - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \lambda_1). \quad (1.5b)$$

Note that $A^2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (\lambda_2, n - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2)$. The A^a are called *simple currents*, and C is called the *(charge) conjugation*. They obey the relations

$$T_{C\lambda, C\mu}^{(n)} = T_{\lambda\mu}^{(n)}, \quad (1.6a)$$

$$S_{C\lambda, \mu}^{(n)} = S_{\lambda\mu}^{(n)*}, \quad (1.6b)$$

$$T_{A^a\lambda, A^a\mu}^{(n)} = \exp[2\pi i\{a^2 n - a t(\lambda)\}/3] T_{\lambda\mu}^{(n)}, \quad (1.6c)$$

$$S_{A^a\lambda, A^b\mu}^{(n)} = \exp[2\pi i\{b t(\lambda) + a t(\mu) + nab\}/3] S_{\lambda\mu}^{(n)}, \quad (1.6d)$$

where $t(\lambda) = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ is called the *triality* of λ . Write $\mathcal{O}$ for this 6 element group, and $\mathcal{O}\lambda$ for the orbit of λ under $\mathcal{O}$. Write $\mathcal{O}_0$ for the 3 element subgroup generated by A .

Our goal is to prove that the only level k $SU(3)$ physical invariants are:

$$\mathcal{A}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k} |\chi_\lambda^k|^2, \quad \forall k \geq 1; \quad (1.7a)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k} \chi_\lambda^k \chi_{A^k t(\lambda)\lambda}^{k*}, \quad \text{for } k \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3} \text{ and } k \geq 4; \quad (1.7b)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{3} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k \\ t(\lambda) \equiv 0 \pmod{3}}} |\chi_\lambda^k + \chi_{A\lambda}^k + \chi_{A^2\lambda}^k|^2, \quad \text{for } k \equiv 0 \pmod{3}; \quad (1.7c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_5 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & |\chi_{1,1}^5 + \chi_{3,3}^5|^2 + |\chi_{1,3}^5 + \chi_{4,3}^5|^2 + |\chi_{3,1}^5 + \chi_{3,4}^5|^2 \\ & + |\chi_{3,2}^5 + \chi_{1,6}^5|^2 + |\chi_{4,1}^5 + \chi_{1,4}^5|^2 + |\chi_{2,3}^5 + \chi_{6,1}^5|^2; \end{aligned} \quad (1.7d)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_9^{(1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\chi_{1,1}^9 + \chi_{1,10}^9 + \chi_{10,1}^9 + \chi_{5,5}^9 + \chi_{5,2}^9 + \chi_{2,5}^9|^2 + 2|\chi_{3,3}^9 + \chi_{3,6}^9 + \chi_{6,3}^9|^2; \quad (1.7e)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_9^{(2)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & |\chi_{1,1}^9 + \chi_{10,1}^9 + \chi_{1,10}^9|^2 + |\chi_{3,3}^9 + \chi_{3,6}^9 + \chi_{6,3}^9|^2 + 2|\chi_{4,4}^9|^2 \\ & + |\chi_{1,4}^9 + \chi_{7,1}^9 + \chi_{4,7}^9|^2 + |\chi_{4,1}^9 + \chi_{1,7}^9 + \chi_{7,4}^9|^2 + |\chi_{5,5}^9 + \chi_{5,2}^9 + \chi_{2,5}^9|^2 \\ & + (\chi_{2,2}^9 + \chi_{2,8}^9 + \chi_{8,2}^9)\chi_{4,4}^{9*} + \chi_{4,4}^9(\chi_{2,2}^{9*} + \chi_{2,8}^{9*} + \chi_{8,2}^{9*}); \end{aligned} \quad (1.7f)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{21} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & |\chi_{1,1}^{21} + \chi_{5,5}^{21} + \chi_{7,7}^{21} + \chi_{11,11}^{21} + \chi_{22,1}^{21} + \chi_{1,22}^{21} \\ & + \chi_{14,5}^{21} + \chi_{5,14}^{21} + \chi_{11,2}^{21} + \chi_{2,11}^{21} + \chi_{10,7}^{21} + \chi_{7,10}^{21}|^2 \\ & + |\chi_{16,7}^{21} + \chi_{7,16}^{21} + \chi_{16,1}^{21} + \chi_{1,16}^{21} + \chi_{11,8}^{21} + \chi_{8,11}^{21} \\ & + \chi_{11,5}^{21} + \chi_{5,11}^{21} + \chi_{8,5}^{21} + \chi_{5,8}^{21} + \chi_{7,1}^{21} + \chi_{1,7}^{21}|^2; \end{aligned} \quad (1.7g)$$

together with their *conjugations* Z^c under C , defined by:

$$(M^c)_{\lambda\mu} = M_{C\lambda, \mu}. \quad (1.7h)$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}_3 = \mathcal{D}_3^c$, $\mathcal{D}_6 = \mathcal{D}_6^c$, $\mathcal{E}_9^{(1)} = \mathcal{E}_9^{(1)c}$, and $\mathcal{E}_{21} = \mathcal{E}_{21}^c$.

The invariants (1.7b) were first found in [1], while (1.7c) was found in [4]. The exceptionals (1.7d, e, g) were found in [6], while (1.7f) was found in [18].

The remainder of this paper is devoted toward proving that eqs.(1.7) exhaust all SU(3) physical invariants.

- Sec. 2* We state here the tools which will be used to accomplish this, some of which are new to [9].
- Sec. 3* We find all permutation invariants for each level k . This argument is based on Sect.3 of [9], but has been improved in a number of places.
- Sec. 4* For each k , we use the ‘parity rule’ to find all weights $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$ which can ‘couple to ρ ’. This is the most difficult part of the paper; it is based on Sect. 4 of [9], but the arguments are given in more detail here, and the most complicated case in [9] (namely $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$) has been completely rewritten. The arguments in this section are elementary but tedious and involve investigating several cases.
- Sec. 5* Everything is put together here. This section is completely rewritten and considerably simplified from Sect. 5 of [9]. One of our tasks here is to find all automorphisms of the ‘simple current extension’ when 3 divides k , but this argument essentially reduces to the one in Sect. 3.
- Sec. 6* This new section explicitly handles the four anomolous levels $k = 5, 9, 21, 57$.

2. The parity rule and other tools

In this section we collect together the various tools(=lemmas) we will be using. All these apply in a far greater context than merely SU(3), but we will state and prove only what we need.

The weight ρ is very special. For one thing, there is the important property that

$$S_{(a,a),\lambda}^{(n)} = \frac{8}{\sqrt{3}n} \sin\left(\frac{\pi a \lambda_1}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi a \lambda_2}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi a (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}{n}\right), \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq a \leq \frac{n-1}{2} \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\text{hence } S_{\rho\lambda}^{(n)} \geq S_{\rho\rho}^{(n)} > 0. \quad (2.1b)$$

When $a = 1$, equality holds in (2.1b) iff $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_0\rho$. (2.1b) and (P3) together suggest the possibility that the values $M_{\rho\mu}$, $M_{\lambda\rho}$ may be important. Indeed this is the case: our first three lemmas given below all tell us *global* information about M , given the *local* knowledge $M_{\rho\mu}, M_{\lambda\rho}$.

Because $T^{(n)}$ is diagonal, (1.4a) is easy to solve: M commutes with $T^{(n)}$ iff

$$\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_2^2 \equiv \mu_1^2 + \mu_1\mu_2 + \mu_2^2 \quad \text{whenever } M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0. \quad (2.1c)$$

A much harder task is to obtain useful information from (1.4b). This is the purpose of this section.

First some definitions. Call a physical invariant M a *permutation invariant* if there exists a permutation σ of $\mathcal{P}^k$ such that

$$M_{\lambda\mu} = \delta_{\mu,\sigma\lambda}. \quad (2.2a)$$

For a given invariant M , let

$$\mathcal{K}_L^\mu(M) = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k \mid M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0\}, \quad (2.2b)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_L(M) = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k \mid \exists \mu \text{ such that } M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0\} = \bigcup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}^k} \mathcal{K}_L^\mu(M), \quad (2.2c)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_L(M) = \{A^a \in \mathcal{O}_0 \mid A^a \rho \in \mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M)\}, \quad (2.2d)$$

$$s_L^\lambda(M) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}^k} S_{\lambda\mu}^{(n)} M_{\mu\rho}, \quad (2.2e)$$

and define $\mathcal{K}_R^\lambda(M)$, $\mathcal{P}_R(M)$, $\mathcal{J}_R(M)$ and $s_R^\mu(M)$ similarly – *e.g.* $\mathcal{K}_R^\lambda(M) = \{\mu \mid M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0\}$. Let $[\lambda]$ denote the orbit $\mathcal{J}_L(M) \lambda$, and $[\mu]'$ denote the orbit $\mathcal{J}_R(M) \mu$.

- Lemma 1.** (a) Let M be any positive invariant. For each $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}^k$, both $s_L^\lambda(M), s_R^\mu(M) \geq 0$. Also, $s_L^\lambda(M) > 0$ iff $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_L(M)$; $s_R^\mu(M) > 0$ iff $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_R(M)$.
(b) Let M be any physical invariant. Then $\mathcal{J}_L(M)$ and $\mathcal{J}_R(M)$ are groups, *i.e.* equal either $\{A^0\}$ or $\mathcal{O}_0 = \{A^0, A^1, A^2\}$.
(c) Let M be any physical invariant. Then $M_{\lambda\mu} = M_{A^a \lambda, A^b \mu}$ for any $A^a \in \mathcal{J}_L(M)$, $A^b \in \mathcal{J}_R(M)$. In other words, there exists a matrix M^e whose entries are non-negative integers, such that $M_{[\rho], [\rho]'}^e = 1$ and

$$Z = \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}^k} M_{\lambda\mu} \chi_\lambda^k \chi_\mu^{k*} = \sum_{[\lambda], [\mu]' \subset \mathcal{P}^k} M_{[\lambda], [\mu]'}^e ch_{[\lambda]} ch_{[\mu]'}'^*,$$

where $ch_{[\lambda]} = \sum_{\nu \in [\lambda]} \chi_\nu^k$, $ch_{[\mu]'}' = \sum_{\nu \in [\mu]'} \chi_\nu^k$.

- (d) Let M be a physical invariant. If say $M_{\lambda\rho} \leq M_{\rho\mu} \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$, then $M_{\rho\lambda} = M_{\lambda\rho} \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$ and $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \mathcal{K}_R^\rho(M)$.
(e) Let M be a physical invariant, and suppose $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = [\rho]$, $\mathcal{K}_R^\rho(M) = [\rho]'$. Then the cardinalities $\|\mathcal{J}_L(M)\| = \|\mathcal{J}_R(M)\|$ are equal, so $\mathcal{J}_L(M) = \mathcal{J}_R(M)$, and $\mathcal{P}_L(M)$ equals the set of all weights with zero charge with respect to $\mathcal{J}_L(M)$, *i.e.*

$$\mathcal{P}_L(M) = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k \mid a t(\lambda) \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \text{ whenever } A^a \in \mathcal{J}_L(M)\}.$$

Proof 1(a) Evaluating $(S^{(n)}M)_{\lambda\rho} = (MS^{(n)})_{\lambda\rho}$ (see (1.4b)) gives us

$$s_L^\lambda(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}^k} S_{\lambda\mu}^{(n)} M_{\mu\rho} = \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}^k} M_{\lambda\mu} S_{\mu\rho}^{(n)}. \quad (2.3a)$$

The RHS of (2.3a) is ≥ 0 , since each $S_{\rho\mu}^{(n)} > 0$, by (2.1b), and each $M_{\mu\lambda} \geq 0$, by (P2). This gives us the first part of 1(a). In fact the RHS of (2.3a) will be > 0 iff some $M_{\lambda\mu} > 0$, *i.e.* iff $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_L(M)$. This gives us the second.

1(b) From $M = S^{(n)\dagger} M S^{(n)}$ and (1.6b) we get

$$\begin{aligned} M_{A^a \rho, \rho} &= |M_{A^a \rho, \rho}| = \left| \sum_{\lambda, \mu} S_{A^a \rho, \lambda}^{(n)*} M_{\lambda \mu} S_{\mu \rho}^{(n)} \right| = \left| \sum_{\lambda, \mu} S_{\rho \lambda}^{(n)*} M_{\lambda \mu} S_{\mu \rho}^{(n)} \exp[-2\pi i a t(\lambda)/3] \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\lambda, \mu} S_{\rho \lambda}^{(n)*} M_{\lambda \mu} S_{\mu \rho}^{(n)} = M_{\rho \rho} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3b)$$

In deriving this we also used (P2) and eq.(2.1b). Equality will happen in (2.3b) iff $a t(\lambda) \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_L(M)$, so 1(b) follows.

1(c) As in 1(b), we get for any $A^a \in \mathcal{J}_L(M)$, $A^b \in \mathcal{J}_R(M)$,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{A^a \lambda, A^b \mu} &= \sum_{\lambda', \mu'} S_{A^a \lambda, \lambda'}^{(n)*} M_{\lambda' \mu'} S_{\mu', A^b \mu}^{(n)} = \sum_{\lambda', \mu'} S_{\lambda \lambda'}^{(n)*} M_{\lambda' \mu'} S_{\mu' \mu}^{(n)} \exp[2\pi i \{b t(\mu') - a t(\lambda')\}/3] \\ &= \sum_{\lambda', \mu'} S_{\lambda \lambda'}^{(n)*} M_{\lambda' \mu'} S_{\mu' \mu}^{(n)} = M_{\lambda \mu}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3c)$$

The third equal sign appears in (2.3c) because we learned in the proof of 1(b) that $A^a \in \mathcal{J}_L(M)$ iff, for all $\lambda' \in \mathcal{P}_L(M)$, $a t(\lambda') \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$.

1(d) By (1.4b) we get

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k} S_{\rho \lambda}^{(n)} M_{\lambda \rho} = (S^{(n)} M)_{\rho \rho} = (M S^{(n)})_{\rho \rho} = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k} M_{\rho \lambda} S_{\lambda \rho}^{(n)} = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k} M_{\lambda \rho} S_{\lambda \rho}^{(n)}. \quad (2.3d)$$

But by (2.1b), each $S_{\rho \lambda}^{(n)} = S_{\lambda \rho}^{(n)} > 0$. Because equality must hold in (2.3d), the desired conclusion holds.

1(e) Each $M_{\rho \mu}, M_{\lambda \rho} \in \{0, 1\}$, by 1(c). Thus $\|\mathcal{J}_L(M)\| = \|\mathcal{J}_R(M)\|$ follows from 1(b), 1(d). In the proof of 1(b) we found that $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_L(M)$ iff λ has zero charge w.r.t. all $\mathcal{J}_L(M)$. QED

Lemma 1 was first proved in [10]. It will play an important role in Sect. 5. Of these, 1(c) is the most important. The hypothesis in 1(d) is often satisfied, because most M have $M_{\rho \mu}, M_{\lambda \rho} \in \{0, 1\}$. In the general case (*i.e.* not $\text{SU}(3)$), we still have $\|\mathcal{J}_L(M)\| = \|\mathcal{J}_R(M)\|$ in 1(e), but this no longer will necessarily mean $\mathcal{J}_L(M) = \mathcal{J}_R(M)$.

The next lemma is Theorem 3 in [8]. The proof was given there, and should be simple and explicit enough that there is no need to repeat it here. The only additional result here is that $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \{\rho\}$ iff $\mathcal{K}_R^\rho(M) = \{\rho\}$; this follows immediately from 1(d).

Lemma 2. Let M be a physical invariant. Then $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \{\rho\}$ iff $\mathcal{K}_R^\rho(M) = \{\rho\}$ iff M is a permutation invariant (see (2.2a)).

Note from (1.4) that the matrix product MM' of two invariants M and M' is again an invariant (at the same level). This should be an important fact, and it is quite possible it has not been exploited enough. Anyways, the next lemma is the main place this property is used. It is proved using the Perron-Frobenius theory of non-negative matrices [14], and can be thought of loosely as a generalization of Lemma 2. It will be used in Sect. 5 to

significantly restrict the possibilities for the sets $\mathcal{K}_{L,R}^\lambda(M)$ of a given physical invariant M , given $\mathcal{K}_{L,R}^\rho(M)$, and also to bound the values of $M_{\lambda\mu}$.

Any matrix M can be written as a direct sum

$$M = \bigoplus_{\ell=1}^{\alpha} B_{\ell} = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & B_2 & & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & B_{\alpha} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.4a)$$

of *indecomposable* blocks B_{ℓ} . In (2.4a) every index i of M is ‘contained’ in one and only one B_{ℓ} . By a *non-negative matrix* we mean a square matrix M with non-negative real entries. Any such matrix has a non-negative real eigenvalue $r = r(M)$ (called the *Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue* [14]) with the property that $r \geq |s|$ for all other (possibly complex) eigenvalues s of M . The number $r(M)$ has many nice properties, for example:

$$\min_i \sum_j M_{ij} \leq r(M) \leq \max_i \sum_j M_{ij}, \quad (2.4b)$$

$$\max_i M_{ii} \leq r(M); \quad (2.4c)$$

provided M is indecomposable and symmetric, either equality holds in (2.4b) iff each row sum $\sum_j M_{ij}$ is equal, and equality holds in (2.4c) iff M is the 1×1 matrix $M = (r)$. Also, there is an eigenvector v with eigenvalue r with components $v_i \geq 0$.

For example, consider the $m \times m$ matrix

$$B_{(\ell,m)} = \begin{pmatrix} \ell & \cdots & \ell \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \ell & \cdots & \ell \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.4d)$$

Its eigenvalues are 0 (multiplicity $m-1$) and $m\ell$ (multiplicity 1). Therefore $r(B_{(\ell,m)}) = m\ell$. The eigenvector v here is $v = (1, \dots, 1)$. These matrices have the important property that they are proportional to their square. They occur frequently in modular invariants.

Lemma 3. (a) Let M be a positive invariant with non-zero indecomposable blocks B_{ℓ} . Call B_1 the block ‘containing’ ρ . Then $r(B_{\ell}) \leq r(B_1)$ for all ℓ .

(b) Suppose now that $B_1^2 = rB_1$, for some scalar r . Then $r(B_{\ell}) = r$ for all ℓ . If in addition $B_1^T = B_1$, then each $M_{\lambda\mu} \leq r$.

(c) Now let M be a physical invariant, and $\mathcal{K}_L^{\rho}(M) = [\rho]$, $\mathcal{K}_R^{\rho}(M) = [\rho]'$. Suppose $M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$, where λ is not a fixed point of $\mathcal{J}_L(M)$ (i.e. $J \in \mathcal{J}_L(M)$ and $J\lambda = \lambda$ implies $J = A^0$) and μ is not a fixed point of $\mathcal{J}_R(M)$. Then $M_{\lambda\nu} \neq 0$ iff $\nu \in [\mu]'$, and $M_{\nu\mu} \neq 0$ iff $\nu \in [\lambda]$.

Proof The proof for (a) was given in [9] (it was called Lemma 3 there); there is no need to repeat the proof here.

3(b) First note that $r = r(B_1)$ (see the proof of Lemma 3 in [9]). Suppose $r(B_{\ell}) < r$, for some ℓ . Look at the sequence of matrices $(\frac{1}{r}M)^j$, for $j \rightarrow \infty$ – this sequence will not in

general converge. However, from $M'_{\rho\rho} = (S^{(n)\dagger} M' S^{(n)})_{\rho\rho}$ and (2.1b) we get the very crude bound

$$\max_{\lambda, \mu} M'_{\lambda\mu} \leq \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}^k} M'_{\lambda\mu} \leq \frac{M'_{\rho\rho}}{S_{\rho\rho}^{(n)2}}, \quad (2.5a)$$

for any positive invariant M' . Therefore the entries of $(\frac{1}{r}M)^j$, for any j , will be bounded above by $M_{\rho\rho}/(rS_{\rho\rho}^{(n)})$, so by Bolzano-Weierstrauss the sequence $(\frac{1}{r}M)^j$ will have convergent subsequences. Let $\{M'_i = (\frac{1}{r}M)^{j_i}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ denote any such subsequence, and let M' be its limit. Clearly, M' will be a positive invariant (by eqs.(1.4)). The point is that $(\frac{1}{r}B_\ell)^j$ goes to the 0-matrix in the $j \rightarrow \infty$ limit (as can be seen using Jordan blocks). If λ is one of the weights 'in' the block B_ℓ , then $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_L(M)$ (because B_ℓ is indecomposable and $B_\ell \neq (0)$), but $\lambda \notin \mathcal{P}_L(M')$ (because $(\frac{1}{r}B_\ell)^j \rightarrow 0$). But by hypothesis $M_{\rho\mu} = r M'_{\rho\mu}$ for all μ , so by Lemma 1(a) we must have $\mathcal{P}_L(M) = \mathcal{P}_L(M')$ – a contradiction.

That each $M_{\lambda\mu} \leq r$ follows now by looking at MM^T : $r(MM^T) = r(B_1 B_1^T) = r^2$, so $r^2 \geq (MM^T)_{\lambda\lambda} \geq M_{\lambda\mu}^2$ by (2.4c).

3(c) Let $m = \|\mathcal{J}_L(M)\|$ ($= \|\mathcal{J}_R(M)\|$ by Lemma 1(e)). Write out the decomposition $\oplus_\ell B_\ell$ for MM^T , as in (2.4a). Let B_1 'contain' ρ , as usual. Then by hypothesis, $B_1 = B_{(m,m)}$ (see eq.(2.4d)), so $r(B_\ell) = m^2$ for each ℓ (by Lemma 3(b)).

Now, let B_i be the block 'containing' λ . Then for all $J, J' \in \mathcal{J}_L(M)$, by Lemma 1(c) we get

$$(B_i)_{J\lambda, J'\lambda} = (B_i)_{\lambda\lambda} = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_R(M)} M_{\lambda\nu}^2 \geq \sum_{\nu \in [\mu]'} M_{\lambda\nu}^2 = m M_{\lambda\mu}^2. \quad (2.5b)$$

Let B_i^λ denote the matrix

$$(B_i^\lambda)_{\nu\nu'} = \begin{cases} m M_{\lambda\mu}^2 & \text{if } \nu, \nu' \in [\lambda] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (2.5c)$$

Then element-wise, $B_i \geq B_i^\lambda$ by (2.5b), so by p.57 of [14] we get that $r(B_i) \geq r(B_i^\lambda)$, with equality iff $B_i = B_i^\lambda$. But $B_i^\lambda = B_{(m M_{\lambda\mu}^2, m)}$ so $m^2 = r(B_i) \geq r(B_i^\lambda) = m^2 M_{\lambda\mu}^2$. Therefore $M_{\lambda\mu} = 1$ and $B_i^\lambda = B_i$.

Using $M^T M$ in place of MM^T , we get the corresponding result for μ . QED

Lemma 2 is a corollary of Lemma 3(c). In Sect. 5, Lemma 3(b,c) will be applied to the case $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \mathcal{K}_R^\rho(M) = \mathcal{O}_{0\rho}$. There is a unique fixed point there: $f = (n/3, n/3)$. So Lemma 3(c) tells us about most of the weights; the main value of Lemma 3(b) for us will be in analysing the possible values of $M_{\lambda f}, M_{f\mu}$, but it will also be useful in Sect.6. Lemma 3 can be strengthened without difficulty, but this is all we will need in this paper.

The final observation we will use is the *parity rule*. Its shortest derivation is in [7]; there is no need to repeat it here. We will only state the result, as it applies to $\text{SU}(3)_k$.

For any real numbers x, y define by $\{x\}_y$ the unique number congruent to x (mod y) satisfying $0 \leq \{x\}_y < y$. Consider any $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbf{Z}$, λ not necessarily in $\mathcal{P}^k$. Define the *parity* $\epsilon(\lambda)$ of λ to be

$$\epsilon(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \{\lambda_1\}_n, \{\lambda_2\}_n \text{ or } \{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2\}_n = 0 \\ +1 & \text{if } \{\lambda_1\}_n + \{\lambda_2\}_n < n \text{ and } \{\lambda_1\}_n, \{\lambda_2\}_n, \{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2\}_n > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } \{\lambda_1\}_n + \{\lambda_2\}_n > n \text{ and } \{\lambda_1\}_n, \{\lambda_2\}_n, \{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2\}_n > 0 \end{cases}. \quad (2.6a)$$

Then it can be shown that $\epsilon(\lambda) \neq 0$ iff there exists a unique root lattice vector $v = \ell(2, -1) + m(1, 1)$, $\ell, m \in \mathbf{Z}$, and a unique Weyl transformation $\omega \in W(A_2)$, such that

$$(\lambda)^+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \omega\lambda + nv \in \mathcal{P}^k; \quad (2.6b)$$

in this case $\epsilon(\lambda) = \det \omega$.

Lemma 4. (a) Let M be any invariant. Choose any $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}^k$. Then, for each ℓ coprime to $3n$, we have $\epsilon(\ell\lambda)\epsilon(\ell\mu) \neq 0$ and

$$M_{\lambda\mu} = \epsilon(\ell\lambda)\epsilon(\ell\mu)M_{(\ell\lambda)^+, (\ell\mu)^+}. \quad (2.7)$$

(b) Now let M be any positive invariant. Then for all ℓ coprime to $3n$, $M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$ implies $\epsilon(\ell\lambda) = \epsilon(\ell\mu)$.

The more useful one for our purposes is Lemma 4(b). In fact, we will be mostly interested in applying it to $\mu = \rho$. This gives us an upper bound on the sets $\mathcal{K}_{L,R}^\rho(M)$, and from there Lemmas 1,2,3 can be used. Eq.(2.7) will be used in Sect.6.

The parity rule is extremely powerful. For example, for the special case n coprime to 6, 4(b) alone is enough to imply that $\mathcal{K}_L^\lambda(M) \subset \mathcal{O}\lambda$, for any positive invariant M . We will not use that here (the complicated proof is given in [16]). Incidentally, a similar result holds for $\text{SU}(2)_k$, k odd – it is natural to ask how this extends to higher rank $\text{SU}(N)$.

The ‘catch’ is that proving anything using the parity rule means immersing oneself in mazes of minute details and special cases. Below is the parity rule for ρ -couplings for the $\text{SU}(2)$ modular invariant classification; it will be used in Sect.4 below, where we will find that the $\text{SU}(2)$ classification is embedded in some way in the $\text{SU}(3)$ one.

Let $\mathcal{C}_L$ denote the set of all numbers coprime to L . In order to apply the parity rule, we need a systematic way of producing lots of numbers ℓ in $\mathcal{C}_L$. Fortunately, this isn’t difficult: for example, consider

$$\ell = \frac{L}{2^i} \pm 2^j.$$

ℓ will lie in $\mathcal{C}_{2L}$ iff either $L/2^i$ is even and $j = 0$, or $L/2^i$ is odd and $j > 0$. The reason is that these choices of i, j guarantee ℓ is odd; any other prime p dividing L will not divide $\pm 2^j$ so cannot divide ℓ .

Choose any integer $m > 2$. Let $\mathcal{K}_m$ denote the set of all integers a , $0 < a < m$, satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \{\ell\}_{2m} < m \quad \text{and} \quad \ell \in \mathcal{C}_{2m} &\Rightarrow \{\ell a\}_{2m} < m; \\ m < \{\ell\}_{2m} < 2m \quad \text{and} \quad \ell \in \mathcal{C}_{2m} &\Rightarrow \{\ell a\}_{2m} > m. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Lemma 5.¹ Define the set $\mathcal{K}_m$ as above. Then

¹ This is slightly more general than Claim 1 of [9], since we drop the condition that a must be odd. The proof is mostly unchanged, apart from many more details included. The proof of Lemma 5 is fortunately as bad as it gets in this paper!

- (a) for $m \neq 6, 10, 12, 30$, we have $\mathcal{K}_m = \{1, m-1\}$;
- (b) $\mathcal{K}_6 = \{1, 3, 5\}$;
 $\mathcal{K}_{10} = \{1, 3, 7, 9\}$;
 $\mathcal{K}_{12} = \{1, 5, 7, 11\}$;
 $\mathcal{K}_{30} = \{1, 11, 19, 29\}$.

Proof Write $m = 2^L m'$, where m' is odd. Define the integer M by $m/2 \leq 2^M < m$. First, note that $a \in \mathcal{K}_m$ iff $m-a \in \mathcal{K}_m$. The reason is that $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_{2m}$ must be odd, so $\{\ell(m-a)\}_{2m}$ equals $m - \{\ell a\}_{2m} < m$ if $\{\ell a\}_{2m} < m$, or $3m - \{\ell a\}_{2m} > m$ if $\{\ell a\}_{2m} > m$.

Let $a \in \mathcal{K}_m$. Define $b = a/m$, so $0 < b < 1$, and write out its *binary* (=base 2) expansion:

$$b = 0.b_1 b_2 b_3 \dots \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i 2^{-i}, \quad b_i \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (2.9a)$$

So $b_i = 0$ means $\{2^i b\}_2 \leq 1$, while $b_i = 1$ means $\{2^i b\}_2 \geq 1$. For example, $\frac{1}{2}$ has binary expansion $0.100\dots = 0.011\dots$, while $\frac{1}{3} = 0.0101\dots$

Case 1: m is odd (i.e. $L = 0$). This is the simplest case. We may assume that a is odd (otherwise replace a with $m-a$). Choose j so that

$$2^{-j+1} > b \geq 2^{-j}. \quad (2.9b)$$

Put $\ell = m - 2^j$; it is coprime to $2m$. Then $\{\ell a\}_{2m} = \{m - 2^j a\}_{2m} = 3m - 2^j a > m$, because a is odd and because of eq.(2.9b). Therefore, by (2.8), $\{\ell\}_{2m} > m$, which can only happen if $m - 2^j < 0$. Eq.(2.9b) now tells us $a < 2m/2^j < 2$, i.e. $a = 1$.

Now, what if m is even? Putting $\ell = m - 1$ forces $a \in \mathcal{K}_m$ to be odd: for if it was even, then $\{\ell a\}_{2m} = 2m - a > m$. We may also assume $a \leq m/2$, i.e. $b \leq \frac{1}{2}$ (otherwise replace a with $m-a$).

Let $c = \{a/2^L\}_2$. There are two different cases: either $0 < c < 1$ (to be called case 2), or $2 > c > 1$ (to be called case 3). $c \neq 0, 1$ because a is odd and $L > 0$.

Case 2: Define $\ell_i = m' + 2^i$. Then for $i = 1, \dots, M-1$, each $\ell_i \in \mathcal{C}_{2m}$, and $0 < \ell_i < m$. Then dividing (2.8) by m tells us that for each $1 \leq i < M$, either $c + \{2^i b\}_2 < 1$ or $2 < c + \{2^i b\}_2$: more precisely, for each $i = 1, \dots, M-1$,

$$\{2^i b\}_2 < 1 - c \quad \text{if} \quad \{2^i b\}_2 < 1, \quad \text{and} \quad 2 - c < \{2^i b\}_2 \quad \text{if} \quad \{2^i b\}_2 > 1. \quad (2.10)$$

Choose j so that (2.9b) holds. Suppose for contradiction that $j < M$. Then by (2.10), $2^{j-1}b = \{2^{j-1}b\}_2 < 1 - c$, but $2^j b = \{2^j b\}_2 > 2 - c$. Hence, $2 - c < 2^j b < 2 - 2c$, i.e. $c < 0$, which is false.

Therefore $b < 2^{1-M}$, i.e. $a < m/2^{M-1} \leq 4$, so a odd implies either $a = 1$ or 3 . All that remains for case 2 is to show $3 \notin \mathcal{K}_m$. We will prove this by contradiction. Note that because $c = 3/2^L < 1$, we must have $L \geq 2$; $a \leq m/2$ then means $m \geq 8$.

If $m \equiv -1 \pmod{3}$ use $\ell = (m+1)/3$, while if $m \equiv +1 \pmod{3}$ use $\ell = (m+2)/3 + m'$. If $m \equiv 0, 3 \pmod{9}$ take $\ell = m/3 + 1$, while if $m \equiv 6 \pmod{9}$ use $\ell = m/3 + 3$. In all cases $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_{2m}$, $0 < \ell < m$, but $\{\ell a\}_{2m} = 3\ell > m$, so (2.8) is violated. Thus $3 \notin \mathcal{K}_m$, and we are done case 2.

Case 3: Take $\ell_i = m' + 2^i$ and $\ell'_j = m' - 2^j$. Then for $i, j > 0$, both $\ell_i, \ell'_j \in \mathcal{C}_{2m}$. For $i = 1, \dots, M-1$, $0 < \ell_i < m$; for $j = 1, \dots, M-L$, $0 < \ell'_j < m$; and for $j = M-L+1, \dots, M$, $-m < \ell'_j < 0$. Therefore:

$$\text{for } 1 \leq i < M, \quad 2 < \{2^i b\}_2 + c < 3; \quad (2.11a)$$

$$\text{for } 1 \leq j \leq M-L, \quad 0 < c - \{2^j b\}_2 < 1; \quad (2.11b)$$

$$\text{for } M-L < j \leq M, \quad \text{either } c < \{2^j b\}_2 \text{ or } 1 + \{2^j b\}_2 < c. \quad (2.11c)$$

Now suppose for some $M-L < j < M$, that $c < \{2^j b\}_2$ but $1 + \{2^{j+1} b\}_2 < c$. Then $b_j = 1$, so $\{2^{j+1} b\}_2 = 2\{2^j b\}_2 - 2$, and we get $c < \{2^j b\}_2 < \frac{c+1}{2}$, contradicting $c > 1$. Similarly, $c < 2$ is contradicted if $1 + \{2^j b\}_2 < c$ but $c < \{2^{j+1} b\}_2$. Thus either $c < \{2^i b\}_2$ for all $M-L < i \leq M$, or $1 + \{2^i b\}_2 < c$ for all $M-L < i \leq M$. Moreover, if $L > 1$ then adding (2.11a) and (2.11c) with $i = j = M-1$ tells us that if $L > 1$ then $c < \{2^i b\}_2$ iff $c < \frac{3}{2}$.

Subtracting (2.11b) from (2.11a) produces the inequality $\frac{1}{2} < \{2^i b\}_2 < \frac{3}{2}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq M-L$. Thus, for these i , $b_i = 0$ iff $b_{i+1} = 1$.

Summarizing, we see that the first M binary digits b_i of b are fixed by the demand that $b_1 = 0$ (since $a \leq m/2$), and eqs.(2.11a-c):

$$0 = b_1 \neq b_2 \neq b_3 \neq \dots \neq b_{M-L} \neq b_{M-L+1} = \dots = b_M, \quad (2.11d)$$

and for $L > 1$, $b_M = 1$ iff $c < \frac{3}{2}$. This fixes the value of b up to a correction of 2^{-M} , i.e. a up to $m/2^M \leq 2$, so a is then completely fixed by the condition that it be odd. To eliminate this value of a (except for 7 special values of m), we will consider 5 subcases.

(i) Consider first $M-L = 1$, i.e. $m = 3 \cdot 2^L$, and $L > 2$ (i.e. $m \neq 6, 12$). Then by (2.11d) the first M binary digits of b are $b = 0.011 \dots 1-$, where “-” denotes the remaining unknown digits b_i , $i > M$. Therefore $1/2 - 1/2^M \leq b \leq 1/2$, i.e. $a = m/2 - \epsilon$ for some $0 \leq \epsilon \leq m/2^M \leq 2$. Therefore $a = m/2 - 1$. Since $m > 14$, $\ell = 7$ lies in $\mathcal{C}_{2m}$ and satisfies $\{\ell a\}_{2m} = \frac{3}{2}m - 7 > m$, violating (2.8).

(ii) Consider next $M-L = 2$, i.e. $m = 5 \cdot 2^L$ or $7 \cdot 2^L$, and $L > 2$ (i.e. $m \neq 10, 20, 14, 28$). Then $b = 0.0100 \dots 0-$, i.e. $a = m/4 + \epsilon$, for $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 2$, so $a = m/4 + 1$. Then using $\ell = 7$ (if $m = 5 \cdot 2^L$) or $\ell = 5$ (if $m = 7 \cdot 2^L$) will violate (2.8).

(iii) Now consider $M-L > 2$, $L > 2$. The first four digits of b will be $b = 0.0101-$. If $c < \frac{3}{2}$ then putting $j = 2$ in (2.11b) gives $c > 1.01$, i.e. $c = 1.01-$. Now by (2.11d), $b_{M-L+1} = \dots = b_M = 1$. Putting $i = M-L+1$ gives $\{2^i b\}_2 + c = 1.11-+1.01- \geq 3$, contradicting (2.11a).

If instead $c > \frac{3}{2}$, then putting $j = 1$ in (2.11b) gives $c = 1.10-$. Eq.(2.11d) says $b_{M-L+1} = \dots = b_M = 0$; putting $i = M-L+1$ gives $\{2^i b\}_2 + c = 0.00-+1.10- \leq 2$, contradicting (2.11a).

(iv) Consider next $M-L > 2$, $L = 2$. Here, either $c = 1.01 = \frac{5}{4}$ or $c = 1.11 = \frac{7}{4}$. Consider first $c = 1.01$, then $b_{M-2} = 0$, $b_{M-3} = b_{M-1} = b_M = 1$ by (2.11d). Putting $j = M-L-1$, we get $c - \{2^j b\}_2 = 1.01 - 1.011- < 0$, contradicting (2.11b). If instead $c = 1.11$, then $j = M-L-1$ gives $1.11 - 0.100- > 1$, also contradicting (2.11b).

(v) Finally(!), look at $M-L > 2$, $L = 1$. Then $c = \frac{3}{2}$ and $m > 16$. From (2.11d) we find that for M even $\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2^M} \leq b \leq \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3 \cdot 2^M}$, and for M odd $\frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{3 \cdot 2^M} \leq b \leq \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2^M}$.

That is, $a = m/3 + \epsilon$, where $-\frac{2}{3} \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{4}{3}$ if M is even, and where $-\frac{4}{3} \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{2}{3}$ if M is odd. So for $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, $a_{\pm} = m/3 \pm 1$, and if $m \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{3}$ we have $a = m/3 \mp 1/3$ respectively.

Taking $\ell = 3$ in (2.8) eliminates $m \equiv -1 \pmod{3}$: $\{\ell a\}_{2m} = m + 1 > m$.

For $m \equiv +1 \pmod{3}$, take $\ell = m/2 + 6$: $\{\ell a\}_{2m} = \frac{10}{6}m - \frac{1}{6}m - 2 = \frac{3}{2}m - 2 > m$.

All that remains is $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, *i.e.* $m \equiv 6, 18, 30 \pmod{36}$. For $m \equiv 6 \pmod{36}$, put $\ell = 4 + m/6$. $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_{2m}$, since $\ell \equiv 5 \pmod{6}$, and $\ell < m$. $\{\ell a_{\pm}\}_{2m} = \frac{4}{3}m \pm 4 + \frac{1}{3}m \pm \frac{1}{6}m = \frac{11}{6}m + 4$ or $\frac{3}{2}m - 4$, in both cases violating (2.8).

For $m \equiv 18 \pmod{36}$, put $\ell = 2 + m/6$. Again $\ell < m$ and $\ell \equiv 5 \pmod{6}$, so $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_{2m}$. $\{\ell a_{\pm}\}_{2m} = \frac{11}{6}m + 2$ or $\frac{3}{2}m - 2$, so (2.8) is violated.

For $m \equiv 30 \pmod{36}$, put $\ell = 6 + m/6$. Again $\ell < m$, and $\ell \equiv 5 \pmod{6}$, so $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_{2m}$. $\{\ell a_{\pm}\}_{2m} = \frac{11}{6}m + 6$ or $\frac{3}{2}m - 6$, so for $m > 36$ (*i.e.* $m \neq 30$), (2.8) is violated.

There were some special values of m that slipped through these arguments: namely $m = 6, 10, 12, 14, 20, 28, 30$. These can be worked out explicitly. QED

3. The permutation invariants

Recall the definition of permutation invariant given in (2.2a). Let M^{σ} denote its coefficient matrix. In this section we will find all $SU(3)_k$ permutation invariants:

Theorem 1. The only level k permutation invariants for $SU(3)$ are $\mathcal{A}_k$, $\mathcal{A}_k^c$ for $k \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, and $\mathcal{A}_k$, $\mathcal{A}_k^c$, $\mathcal{D}_k$, $\mathcal{D}_k^c$ for $k \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$.

That the matrix M^{σ} must commute with $S^{(n)}$ (see (1.4b)) is equivalent to

$$S_{\lambda\mu}^{(n)} = S_{\sigma\lambda, \sigma\mu}^{(n)}, \quad \forall \lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}^k. \quad (3.1)$$

Of course, (P3) tells us $\sigma\rho = \rho$.

Verlinde's formula gives us a relation between the fusion coefficients $N_{\lambda\mu\nu}^{(n)}$ and the $S^{(n)}$ matrix:

$$N_{\lambda\mu\nu}^{(n)} = \sum_{\lambda' \in \mathcal{P}^k} \frac{S_{\lambda\lambda'}^{(n)} S_{\mu\lambda'}^{(n)} S_{\nu\lambda'}^{(n)}}{S_{\rho\lambda'}^{(n)}}. \quad (3.2a)$$

We may take (3.2a) as a formal definition of $N_{\lambda\mu\nu}^{(n)}$. Eq.(3.1) tells us that

$$N_{\lambda\mu\nu}^{(n)} = N_{\sigma\lambda, \sigma\mu, \sigma\nu}^{(n)}. \quad (3.2b)$$

Eq.(3.2b) is useful to us, because these fusion coefficients have been computed for $SU(3)_k$ [3], by a method based on (3.2a). The formula is:

$$N_{\lambda\mu\nu}^{(n)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \leq n_{\min} \text{ or } \delta = 0 \\ n - n_{\min} & \text{if } n_{\min} \leq n \leq n_{\max} \text{ and } \delta = 1, \\ n_{\max} - n_{\min} & \text{if } n \geq n_{\max} \text{ and } \delta = 1 \end{cases}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$, $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{1}{3}[2(\lambda_1 + \mu_1 + \nu_1) + \lambda_2 + \mu_2 + \nu_2], \\ B &= \frac{1}{3}[\lambda_1 + \mu_1 + \nu_1 + 2(\lambda_2 + \mu_2 + \nu_2)], \\ n_{min} &= \max\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2, \nu_1 + \nu_2, A - \min\{\lambda_1, \mu_1, \nu_1\}, B - \min\{\lambda_2, \mu_2, \nu_2\}\}, \\ n_{max} &= \min\{A, B\}, \\ \delta &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n_{max} > n_{min} \text{ and } A, B \in \mathbf{Z} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

The first step in the proof of Thm.1 is to show that ‘point-wise’ σ acts like an outer automorphism. To see this, first take $\lambda = \mu = \nu = (a, b)$. Then (3.3) reduces to

$$N_{\lambda\lambda\lambda}^{(n)} = \min\{a, b, n - a - b\}. \quad (3.4a)$$

Eqs.(3.2b) and (3.4a) imply that

$$\sigma(a, b) \in \bigcup_c \{\mathcal{O}(a, c) \cup \mathcal{O}(b, c) \cup \mathcal{O}(n - a - b, c)\}. \quad (3.4b)$$

Also, from eq.(3.1) we get $S_{\lambda\rho}^{(n)} = S_{\sigma\lambda, \rho}^{(n)}$. Then the following result forces $\sigma\lambda \in \mathcal{O}\lambda$:

Claim 1. Choose any $\lambda = (a, b), \mu = (a', b') \in \mathcal{P}^k$. If $\{a, b, n - a - b\} \cap \{a', b', n - a' - b'\} \neq \{\}$, and if $S_{\lambda\rho}^{(n)} = S_{\mu\rho}^{(n)}$, then $\mu \in \mathcal{O}\lambda$.

Proof. Suppose $(a', b') = A^i C^j(a, c)$ for some i, j . Then $S_{ab, \rho}^{(n)} = S_{A^i C^j(a, c), \rho}^{(n)}$, i.e. $S_{ab, \rho}^{(n)} = S_{ac, \rho}^{(n)}$ by eqs.(1.6). Eq.(1.3d) reduces this to

$$\sin\left(\frac{2\pi b}{n}\right) - \sin\left(\frac{2\pi(a+b)}{n}\right) = \sin\left(\frac{2\pi c}{n}\right) - \sin\left(\frac{2\pi(a+c)}{n}\right). \quad (3.5)$$

Define $f_\alpha(x) = \sin(x) - \sin(x + \alpha)$. We are interested in finding all solutions $f_\alpha(x) = f_\alpha(y)$, where $x, y, \alpha > 0$ and $x + \alpha, y + \alpha < 2\pi$. But since trigonometry tells us $f_\alpha(x) = -2\sin(\alpha/2) \cos(x + \alpha/2)$, it is trivial to solve this. The only solutions in the given interval are $y = x$ and $y = 2\pi - x - \alpha$. Hence the only possible solutions to (3.5) are: $c = b$ and $c = n - a - b$. In other words,

$$\mu \in \bigcup_c \mathcal{O}(a, c) \Rightarrow \mu \in \mathcal{O}(a, b). \quad (3.6)$$

The calculation and conclusion for $\mu \in \mathcal{O}(b, c)$ is completely identical to that for (3.6), except that the roles of a and b are interchanged. Similarly for $\mu \in \mathcal{O}(n - a - b, c)$, except with a above replaced with $n - a - b$ here. QED to Claim 1

The claim, together with (2.1c), tells us that the only possibilities for $\sigma(1, 2)$ are:

$$\sigma(1, 2) \in \{(1, 2), (2, 1)\} \text{ if } k \equiv 0 \pmod{3}, \quad (3.7a)$$

$$\sigma(1, 2) \in \{(1, 2), (2, 1), (2, k), (k, 2)\} \text{ if } k \equiv 1 \pmod{3}, \quad (3.7b)$$

$$\sigma(1, 2) \in \{(1, 2), (2, 1), (k, 1), (1, k)\} \text{ if } k \equiv 2 \pmod{3}. \quad (3.7c)$$

Note that the possibilities for $k \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ are realized by $\mathcal{A}_k$ and $\mathcal{A}_k^c$, respectively, and for $k \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{3}$ by $\mathcal{A}_k$, $\mathcal{A}_k^c$, $\mathcal{D}_k$ and $\mathcal{D}_k^c$, respectively. Since the (matrix) product $M^\sigma M^{\sigma'}$ of two permutation invariants M^σ , $M^{\sigma'}$ is another permutation invariant $M^{\sigma'\sigma}$, to prove Thm.1 for each k it suffices to show that the only permutation invariant satisfying $\sigma(1, 2) = (1, 2)$ is $\mathcal{A}_k$.

Choose any $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$. Then $\sigma\lambda = C^i A^j \lambda$ for some i, j , by Claim 1. Then (3.1) tells us $S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)} = S_{(1,2),C^i A^j \lambda}^{(n)}$. By the following claim this forces $\sigma\lambda = C^i A^j \lambda = \lambda$. QED to Thm.1

Claim 2. For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$, $S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)} = S_{(1,2),C^i A^j \lambda}^{(n)}$ iff $\lambda = C^i A^j \lambda$.

Proof Suppose for some $1 \leq a < n-1$ that $S_{12,1a}^{(n)} = S_{12,1a}^{(n)*}$. Then

$$c_n(5a+4) + c_n(a+5) + c_n(4a-1) = c_n(4a+5) + c_n(5a+1) + c_n(a-4), \quad (3.8a)$$

where $c_n(x) = \cos(2\pi \frac{x}{3n})$. Making the substitution $b = a + \frac{1}{2}$, we would like to show that

$$p(b, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c_n(5b + \frac{3}{2}) + c_n(b + \frac{9}{2}) + c_n(4b - 3) - c_n(4b + 3) - c_n(5b - \frac{3}{2}) - c_n(b - \frac{9}{2}) \quad (3.8b)$$

does not vanish for $\frac{3}{2} < b < n - \frac{1}{2}$.

Using the obvious trigonometric identities (*i.e.* the angle-sum formulas, and $\sin^2 = 1 - \cos^2$) we can rewrite $p(b, n)$ as a polynomial in $c_n(b)$ and $s_n(b) = \sin(2\pi \frac{b}{3n})$ – in particular, $p(b, n) = p_5^{(n)}(c_n(b)) + s_n(b) \cdot p_4^{(n)}(c_n(b))$, where $p_5^{(n)}$ and $p_4^{(n)}$ are, respectively, degree 5 and 4 polynomials. Note from (3.8b) that $p(-b, n) = -p(b, n)$, so $p_5^{(n)}$ must be identically zero:

$$p(b, n) = s_n(b) \cdot p_4^{(n)}(c_n(b)). \quad (3.8c)$$

We are interested in the roots of this function, in the range $b \in (0, \frac{3}{2}n)$. Since for these b $s_n(b)$ does not vanish and c_n is one-to-one, for fixed k there can be at most 4 zeros for $p_4^{(n)}$ and hence $p(b, n)$ in that range. But $b = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, n - \frac{1}{2}, n + \frac{1}{2}$ are 4 distinct zeros for $p(b, n)$. Therefore they are the *only* zeros in the range $b \in (0, \frac{3}{2}n)$, and so $p(b, n)$ cannot vanish when $\frac{3}{2} < b < n - \frac{1}{2}$.

This argument is quite general. It isn't necessary to assume a is an integer; (1.3d) can be used to formally define $S_{\lambda\mu}^{(n)}$ for arbitrary n, λ, μ . All that is required for our argument is that $n > 1$ (so that the root $b = n + \frac{1}{2}$ satisfies $0 < b < \frac{3}{2}n$) and $n \neq 2$ (so $n - \frac{1}{2} \neq \frac{3}{2}$).

Now choose any $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$. Wlog suppose $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. Put $n' = n/\lambda_1$ and $a = \lambda_2/\lambda_1$. Then $1 \leq a < n' - 1$ and $n' > 2$. We see that $S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)} = \frac{n'}{n} S_{(1,2),(1,a)}^{(n')}$. This means we have

the equation $S_{(1,2),(1,a)}^{(n')} = S_{(1,2),(1,a)}^{(n')*}$. But from the first part of this argument, we know that this is possible only for $a = 1$, *i.e.* $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$.

Now suppose $S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)} = 0$. Then by (1.6d), $S_{(1,2),A^i\lambda}^{(n)} = 0$ for all i . Because these are all real, $(A^i\lambda)_1 = (A^i\lambda)_2$ for all i , *i.e.* $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = n - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, *i.e.* $\lambda = (n/3, n/3)$.

Finally, suppose $S_{(1,2),C^iA^j\lambda}^{(n)} = S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)}$. Consider first the case where $i = 1$. We get

$$S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)} = \omega^j S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)*}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad S_{(1,2),A^{-j}\lambda}^{(n)} = S_{(1,2),A^{-j}\lambda}^{(n)*}, \quad (3.9a)$$

where $\omega = \exp[2\pi i/3]$. We know this implies $(A^{-j}\lambda)_1 = (A^{-j}\lambda)_2$, *i.e.* $CA^{-j}\lambda = A^{-j}\lambda$. Therefore $\lambda = A^jCA^{-j}\lambda = CA^{-j}A^{-j}\lambda = C^iA^j\lambda$.

Now suppose $i = 0$. Then

$$S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)} = \omega^{-j} S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)}. \quad (3.9b)$$

If $j \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, then trivially $C^iA^j\lambda = \lambda$. Otherwise, (3.9b) requires $S_{(1,2),\lambda}^{(n)} = 0$. We know this means $\lambda = (n/3, n/3)$, so again $C^iA^j\lambda = \lambda$. QED to Claim 2

4. The ρ -couplings

Define

$$\mathcal{R}^k = \bigcup_M \mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \bigcup_M \mathcal{K}_R^\rho(M),$$

the unions being over all positive invariants M of $SU(3)_k$. For example, the known $SU(3)$ physical invariants (1.7) tell us that $\mathcal{R}^5 \supseteq \{(1,1), (3,3)\}$, $\mathcal{R}^6 \supseteq \{(1,1), (7,1), (1,7)\}$ and $\mathcal{R}^7 \supseteq \{(1,1)\}$. $\mathcal{R}^k$ is called the set of ρ -couplings at level k . We learned in Sect.2 that the ρ -couplings should be both accessible and informative. For instance, if $\mathcal{R}^k = \{\rho\}$ then by Lemma 2 any level k physical invariant will be a permutation invariant, and will be listed in Thm.1.

Let $\lambda = (a, b) \in \mathcal{R}^k$. Then by (2.1c) it must satisfy

$$a^2 + ab + b^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{3n}. \quad (4.1a)$$

Another important property comes from Lemma 4(b):

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \{\ell\} < n/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \ell \in \mathcal{C}_n &\Rightarrow \{\ell a\} + \{\ell b\} < n, \\ n/2 < \{\ell\} < n \quad \text{and} \quad \ell \in \mathcal{C}_n &\Rightarrow \{\ell a\} + \{\ell b\} > n. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1b)$$

Two comments about (4.1b) must be made. One is that, throughout this section, we will write $\{\dots\}$ for $\{\dots\}_n$. The other is that we write in (4.1b) that $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_n$, not $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_{3n}$. The reason is that for any $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_n$, there can be found an $\ell' \in \mathcal{C}_{3n}$ such that $\ell \equiv \ell' \pmod{n}$; from (2.6a) we see that $\epsilon(\ell\lambda) = \epsilon(\ell'\lambda)$ for any λ .

This section is devoted to a proof of:

Theorem 2. The only solutions to eqs.(4.1) are:

(i) for $k \equiv 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11 \pmod{12}$:

$$(a, b) \in \{(1, 1)\}; \quad (4.2a)$$

(ii) for $k \equiv 1, 5 \pmod{12}$:

$$(a, b) \in \{(1, 1), (\frac{k+1}{2}, \frac{k+1}{2})\}; \quad (4.2b)$$

(iii) for $k \equiv 0, 3, 6 \pmod{12}$:

$$(a, b) \in \{(1, 1), (1, k+1), (k+1, 1)\}; \quad (4.2c)$$

(iv) for $k \equiv 9 \pmod{12}$, $k \neq 21, 57$:

$$(a, b) \in \{(1, 1), (1, k+1), (2, \frac{k+1}{2}), (k+1, 1), (\frac{k+1}{2}, 2), (\frac{k+1}{2}, \frac{k+1}{2})\}; \quad (4.2d)$$

(v) for $k = 21$ and $k = 57$, resp.:

$$(a, b) \in \mathcal{O}_0(1, 1) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(5, 5) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(7, 7) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(11, 11); \quad (4.2e)$$

$$(a, b) \in \mathcal{O}_0(1, 1) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(11, 11) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(19, 19) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(29, 29). \quad (4.2f)$$

The reason $k = 21$ and $k = 57$ are singled out here turns out to be the same (see Lemma 5) as the reason $k = 10$ and $k = 28$ are singled out in the corresponding ρ -couplings for $SU(2)_k$. Indeed, $21 + 3 = 2(10 + 2)$ and $57 + 3 = 2(28 + 2)$. This embedding of the $SU(2)_k$ classification inside the $SU(3)_{2k+1}$ one remains a mystery, at least to me!

We will prove Thm.2 later in the section. For now let us consider what would happen if it were true. It gives an upper bound for the sets $\mathcal{R}^k$. So for half of the levels, Thm.2 reduces the completeness proof to the classification of the permutation invariants, which was accomplished in Thm.1. Thm.2 turns out to be sufficient to complete the $SU(3)_k$ classification for all k (this is done in Sect.5).

Claim 3. For any k and any $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$, λ satisfies the parity condition (4.1b) iff every $\lambda' \in \mathcal{O}\lambda$ does. Moreover, if $\lambda = (a, b)$ satisfies the condition

$$a^2 + ab + b^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{n}, \quad (4.3)$$

then so will every $\lambda' \in \mathcal{O}\lambda$.

The proof of Claim 3 is a straightforward calculation. For example, if $\{\ell a\} + \{\ell b\} < n$, then $\{\ell n - \ell a - \ell b\} + \{\ell a\} = n - \{\ell a\} - \{\ell b\} + \{\ell a\} = n - \{\ell b\} < n$; while if $\{\ell a\} + \{\ell b\} > n$ then the same calculation gives $\{\ell n - \ell a - \ell b\} + \{\ell a\} = 2n - \{\ell b\} > n$.

Because of Claim 3, we will restrict our attention for the remainder of this section to any weight $(a, b) \in \mathcal{P}^k$ satisfying the parity condition (4.1b) and the norm condition (4.3). By Claim 3 this set of possible λ is invariant under the outer automorphisms $\mathcal{O}$. What we will actually prove is the simpler (and more general):

Proposition 1. The set of all solutions $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$ to (4.1b) and (4.3), where $n = k + 3$, is:

- (a) for $n \equiv 1, 2, 3 \pmod{4}$, $n \neq 18$: $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_0\rho$;
- (b) for $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, $n \neq 12, 24, 60$: $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_0\rho \cup \mathcal{O}_0(\rho')$, where $\rho' = (\frac{n-2}{2}, \frac{n-2}{2})$;
- (c) for $n = 12, 18, 24, 60$, respectively, λ lies in

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{O}_0\rho \cup \mathcal{O}_0(3, 3) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(5, 5), \\ & \mathcal{O}_0\rho \cup \mathcal{O}_0(1, 4), \\ & \mathcal{O}_0\rho \cup \mathcal{O}_0(5, 5) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(7, 7) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(11, 11), \\ & \mathcal{O}_0\rho \cup \mathcal{O}_0(11, 11) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(19, 19) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(29, 29). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Prop.1 when $n \equiv 0$. We learn from the norm condition (4.3) that two of a, b and $n - a - b$ will be odd and one will be even; from Claim 3 we may assume for now that both a and b are odd. Let $0 < \ell < n/2$, $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_n$. Then $\ell' = \ell + n/2$ will also lie in $\mathcal{C}_n$ but will fall in the range $n/2$ to n . Then (4.1b) tells us

$$\{\ell a\} + \{\ell b\} < n < \{\ell' a\} + \{\ell' b\}. \quad (4.4)$$

But a is odd, so $\{\ell' a\} = \{n/2 + \ell a\}$ equals $n/2 + \{\ell a\}$ if $\{\ell a\} < n/2$, or $-n/2 + \{\ell a\}$ if $\{\ell a\} > n/2$. A similar comment applies to b . If $n/2 < \{\ell a\}$, then $\{\ell' a\} + \{\ell' b\} = -n/2 + \{\ell a\} \pm n/2 + \{\ell b\} \leq \{\ell a\} + \{\ell b\}$, contradicting (4.4); similarly with b . So $\{\ell a\}, \{\ell b\} < n/2$. Thus, putting $m = n/2$ we get exactly the situation stated in Lemma 5. From there we read that the only possibilities for a and b are 1 and $(n - 2)/2$, unless $n = 12, 20, 24, 60$. From these we can also compute the possibilities for $n - a - b$. Eq.(4.3) now reduces this list of possibilities to those given in the Proposition. **QED** when 4 divides n

Thus it suffices to consider $n \equiv 1, 2, 3 \pmod{4}$. First we will prove two useful results.

Claim 4. For $n \equiv 1, 2, 3 \pmod{4}$, if $a = b$ then $a = b = 1$.

Proof. Clearly $a < n/2$, since $a + b < n$. For n even, (4.1b) reduces to the hypothesis of Lemma 5 with $m = n/2$, and we get $a = 1$.

Otherwise, n is odd. Let $N > 0$ be the unique integer for which $2^N < n/2 < 2^{N+1}$. Similarly, let $j \geq 0$ be the smallest integer for which $2^j a < n/2 < 2^{j+1} a$. Assume for contradiction that $a > 1$. Then $0 \leq j < N$. Take $\ell = 2^{j+1} < n/2$. Then we get $\{\ell a\} + \{\ell b\} = 2(2^{j+1} a) > n$, contradicting (4.1b). **QED** to Claim 4

Claim 5.² The greatest common divisors $\gcd(a, n)$, $\gcd(b, n)$, $\gcd(n - a - b, n) = \gcd(a + b, n)$, equal either 1 or 2 (except for $n = 12$).

Proof. By Claim 3 it suffices to prove $\gcd(a, n) \leq 2$. Suppose for contradiction a prime $p \neq 2$ divides both a and n . Consider first $p = 3$. Then (4.3) tells us that 3 must also divide b , and that 9 cannot divide n (otherwise (4.3) would imply $0 \equiv 3 \pmod{9}$). Look at $\ell_m = 3 + mn/3$; then $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \mathcal{C}_n$, and for $n > 18$, $0 < \ell_1 < n/2 < \ell_2 < n$. However,

² The proof of this claim given in [9] was cryptic enough to have given a lot of people problems. The idea I had in mind was quite geometrical, and essentially along the lines given here. The statement of the claim here is actually slightly more general, since it uses only (4.3) – this is also the reason for the $n=12$ exception here.

$\{\ell_m a\} + \{\ell_m b\} = \{3a + mn\frac{a}{3}\} + \{3b + mn\frac{b}{3}\} = \{3a\} + \{3b\}$ is independent of m , so either ℓ_1 or ℓ_2 must violate (4.1b). (The remaining heights $n = 6, 12, 15$ can be checked by hand; only $n = 12$ turns out to allow 3 to divide a .)

Now consider other primes p . By (4.3), $b^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{p}$, which has no solutions if $p \leq 7$. Let $\ell_m = 1 + mn/p$, $m = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$. Then $\ell_m \in \mathcal{C}_n$ iff $\ell_m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, so except possibly for one value of m , call it m_0 , each ℓ_m will lie in $\mathcal{C}_n$. Since p divides both a and n , and $0 < a < n$, we know $n \neq p$. Therefore $0 < \ell_m < n/2$ for all $0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$, and $n/2 < \ell_m < n$ for $\frac{p+1}{2} \leq m \leq p-1$. So from (4.1b) we get

$$\{b + m\frac{bn}{p}\} < n - a \quad (4.5a)$$

for each m satisfying $0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$ (except possibly $m = m_0$), and

$$\{b + m\frac{bn}{p}\} \geq n - a \quad (4.5b)$$

for each m satisfying $\frac{p+1}{2} \leq m \leq p-1$ (except possibly $m = m_0$). An ‘=’ has been added to (4.5b), purely for later convenience.

Now define $b' = \{b + \frac{p}{2}\}_p - \frac{p}{2}$ (so $b' \equiv b \pmod{p}$ and $-\frac{p}{2} \leq b' < \frac{p}{2}$). The geometric picture: each time m is incremented by 1, $\{\ell_m b\} = \{b + m\frac{b'n}{p}\}$ changes by precisely $\frac{b'n}{p}$, unless $\ell_m b$ “crosses” an integer multiple of n , in which case $\{\ell_m b\}$ changes by $\pm n + \frac{b'n}{p}$. From this picture we can see that if each m in $m_1 \leq m \leq m_2$ satisfies (4.5a), then

$$|b'| \frac{n}{p} (m_2 - m_1) < n - a, \quad (4.5c)$$

unless $|b'| \frac{n}{p} > a$; similarly, if each m in $m_3 \leq m \leq m_4$ satisfies (4.5b), then

$$|b'| \frac{n}{p} (m_4 - m_3) < a, \quad (4.5d)$$

unless $|b'| \frac{n}{p} > n - a$. We will use (4.5c, d) to prove $|b'| \leq 1$; this would mean $b \equiv +1, 0, -1 \pmod{p}$, none of which can satisfy (4.3) (which tells us $b^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{p}$).

First let us eliminate the possibilities $|b'| \frac{n}{p} > a$ and $|b'| \frac{n}{p} > n - a$. The former would violate (4.5d) if we had an m such that both m and $m+1$ satisfied (4.5b) (since if also $|b'| \frac{n}{p} > n - a$, this would contradict $|b'| \leq \frac{p}{2}$). But there are $\frac{p-1}{2}$ numbers between $\frac{p+1}{2}$ and $p-1$ inclusive, only one of which can equal m_0 . Therefore if $\frac{p-1}{2} > 3$, i.e. $p > 7$, such an m will exist. Similarly, to eliminate $|b'| \frac{n}{p} > n - a$ requires that $p > 5$.

Suppose now that $0 < m_0 < \frac{p-1}{2}$, and that m_0 satisfies (4.5b). Then $\{\ell_{m_0 \pm 1} b\} < n - a \leq \{\ell_{m_0} b\}$, which forces $2|b'| \frac{n}{p} > a$ by our geometric picture. But because $p > 7$, $\frac{p+5}{2} \leq p-1$, so $m = \frac{p+1}{2}, \frac{p+3}{2}, \frac{p+5}{2}$ all must satisfy (4.5b). Eq.(4.5d) now tells us $2|b'| \frac{n}{p} < a$, and we get a contradiction. Thus if $0 < m_0 < \frac{p-1}{2}$, then m_0 satisfies (4.5a). The identical argument shows that if $\frac{p+1}{2} < m_0 < p-1$, then m_0 must satisfy (4.5b).

Thus there are exactly 4 possibilities ($m_0 = 0$ cannot happen):

- (i) eq.(4.5a) holds for all $0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$, and (4.5b) holds for all $\frac{p+1}{2} \leq m \leq p-1$;
- (ii) $m_0 = \frac{p-1}{2}$, and m_0 satisfies (4.5b);
- (iii) $m_0 = \frac{p+1}{2}$, and m_0 satisfies (4.5a);
- (iv) $m_0 = p-1$ and m_0 satisfies (4.5a).

In case (i) define $m_1 = 0$, $m_2 = \frac{p-1}{2}$; in (ii) define $m_1 = 0$, $m_2 = \frac{p-3}{2}$; in (iii) define $m_1 = 0$, $m_2 = \frac{p+1}{2}$; and in (iv) define $m_1 = -1$, $m_2 = \frac{p-1}{2}$. Then in all four cases we have (4.5a) satisfied for all $m_1 \leq m \leq m_2$, and (4.5b) satisfied for all $m_2 < m \leq p+m_1-1$. Then (4.5c, d) tell us $|b'| \frac{n}{p}(m_2 - m_1) < n - a$ and $|b'| \frac{n}{p}(p + m_1 - 1 - m_2 - 1) < a$. Adding these gives $|b'| \frac{n}{p}(p - 2) < n$, i.e. $|b'| < \frac{p}{p-2} < 2$, i.e. $|b'| \leq 1$. But as we said this contradicts (4.3).

Therefore, $p = 2$ is the only prime that can divide both a and n . Since (4.3) shows 4 cannot divide both (since then $b^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, which has no integer solutions), the only possibilities for $\gcd(a, n)$ are 1 or 2. **QED** to Claim 5

Proof of Prop.1 for n odd. From Claim 3 we may assume $1 \leq a, b < n/2$. We need to show $a = b = 1$.

First take $\ell = (n-1)/2$; it lies in $\mathcal{C}_n$ and is less than $n/2$. If a is even, $\{\ell a\} = n - a/2$, and if a is odd, $\{\ell a\} = n/2 - a/2$. The same applies for b . Hence $\{\ell a\} + \{\ell b\} = in + (n - a - b)/2$, where $i = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ depending on whether 0, 1 or both of a, b are even. But $i \geq 1$ contradicts (4.1b) – since as always $a + b < n$. Therefore both a and b must be odd.

Eq.(4.3) tells us $\{a^2\} + \{ab\} + \{b^2\} = 3 + mn$, for some integer m . Since by definition $0 \leq \{\dots\} < n$, we have $m = 0, 1$, or 2 . But $m = 2$ would imply $\{a^2\} + \{ab\} = 3 + 2n - \{b^2\} > n$, which contradicts (4.1b) with $\ell = a$ ($a < n/2$ by hypothesis, and $a \in \mathcal{C}_n$ by Claim 5).

Next suppose $m = 1$, i.e.

$$\{a^2\} + \{ab\} + \{b^2\} = n + 3. \quad (4.6)$$

Choose $\ell' = (n+a)/2$, $\ell'' = (n+b)/2$ – again Claim 5 tells us these lie in $\mathcal{C}_n$, and both satisfy $n/2 < \ell', \ell'' < n$. Then $\ell'a \equiv n/2 + a^2/2 \pmod{n}$, so $\{\ell'a\} = \{a^2\}/2 + n/2$ if $\{a^2\}$ is odd, and $\{a^2\}/2$ if $\{a^2\}$ is even. Similarly, $\{\ell'b\} = \{\ell''a\} = \{ab\}/2 + n/2$ or $\{ab\}/2$, depending on whether $\{ab\}$ is odd or even, resp., and $\{\ell''b\} = \{b^2\}/2 + n/2$ if $\{b^2\}$ is odd, and $\{b^2\}/2$ if $\{b^2\}$ is even. But (4.6) tells us that $\{a^2\} + \{ab\} + \{b^2\}$ is even, so either all three are even, or 2 are odd and 1 is even. If $\{a^2\}$ or $\{ab\}$ (or both) are even, then using ℓ' in (4.1b) gives $n < \{\ell'a\} + \{\ell'b\} \leq \{a^2\}/2 + n/2 + \{ab\}/2$, i.e. $n < \{a^2\} + \{ab\}$, but this contradicts (4.1b) with $\ell = a$ chosen (by hypothesis $a < n/2$, and $a \in \mathcal{C}_n$ by Claim 5). Similarly, if instead $\{b^2\}$ is even, then using ℓ'' in (4.1b) contradicts using b in (4.1b).

Thus $m = 0$ is forced. This requires $\{a^2\} = \{ab\} = \{b^2\} = 1$, i.e. $a^2 \equiv ab \equiv b^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$; Claim 5 tells us a is invertible $\pmod{n}$, so $a^2 \equiv ab \pmod{n}$ implies $a \equiv b \pmod{n}$, i.e. $a = b$. Claim 4 now forces $a = b = 1$. **QED** to Prop.1 for n odd

*Proof of Prop.1 for $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$.*³ This is the final possibility. From (4.3) we get that both a and b cannot be even, so by Claim 3 we may assume a, b are both odd, and that

³ This argument was quite complicated in [9]; it has been completely rewritten here. I think this proof is

$a \leq b$. Then $a + b < n$ implies $a < n/2$, so $\{a^2\} + \{ab\} < n$ by (4.1b). We want to show $a = b = 1$.

Now, exactly as in the proof for n odd, $\{a^2\} + \{ab\} + \{b^2\} = 2n + 3$ contradicts (4.1b) with $\ell = a$ chosen. Also, $\{a^2\} + \{ab\} + \{b^2\} = 3$ requires $a = b$ and hence $a = b = 1$, again exactly as in the proof for n odd.

Thus it suffices to consider the case where (4.6) is satisfied. Define M by $2^M < n/2 < 2^{M+1}$, so $n/2^M < 4$. As in (2.9a), write out the binary expansions $a/n = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i 2^{-i}$, $b/n = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i 2^{-i}$, where each $a_i, b_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Note that we cannot have all but finitely many a_i or b_i equal to 1, say (same for 0), because that would mean a/n or b/n , respectively, was a dyadic rational (*i.e.* its denominator is a power of 2) – but $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, so this would force $a = n/2$ or $b = n/2$, which contradicts Claim 5.

Consider $\ell_i = n/2 + 2^i$, $i = 1, \dots, M$. Then $\ell_i \in \mathcal{C}_n$, and $n/2 < \ell_i < n$, so by (4.1b)

$$n < \{\ell_i a\} + \{\ell_i b\} = \left\{ \frac{n}{2} + 2^i a \right\} + \left\{ \frac{n}{2} + 2^i b \right\} = \{2^i a\} + \{2^i b\} + \begin{cases} n & \text{if } a_{i+1} = b_{i+1} = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } a_{i+1} + b_{i+1} = 1 \\ -n & \text{if } a_{i+1} = b_{i+1} = 1 \end{cases} \quad (4.7a)$$

The reason for (4.7a) is that $\{2^i a\} > n/2$ iff $a_{i+1} = 1$ (similarly for b). Now, $\{\dots\} < n$, so (4.7a) forbids $a_{i+1} = b_{i+1} = 1$, for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ (the relation $a + b < n$ forbids it for $i = 0$).

Define I by $n/2^I < b < n/2^{I-1}$, *i.e.* $b_i = 0$ for $i < I$ and $b_I = 1$. If $I - 1 > M$, then $a \leq b < 2$, *i.e.* $a = b = 1$. So we may suppose $I - 1 \leq M$.

Consider first the case $I > 1$. Then (4.7a) with $i = I - 1$ tells us $n < \{2^{I-1} a\} + \{2^{I-1} b\} = 2^{I-1} a + 2^{I-1} b$, *i.e.* $n/2^{I-1} < a + b$. This is a strong inequality because the biggest $a + b$ can be is if $a_i + b_i = 1$ for $I \leq i \leq M + 1$, and $a_j = b_j = 1$ for $j > M + 1$: this leads to the bound $a + b < n/2^{I-1} + n/2^{M+1}$. But if instead $a_i = b_i = 0$ for some $i \leq M + 1$, then $a + b < n/2^{I-1} + n/2^{M+1} - n/2^i \leq n/2^{I-1}$, contradicting the ℓ_{I-1} result. Thus $a_i + b_i = 1$ is indeed forced for all $i \leq M + 1$: *i.e.*

$$I > 1 \Rightarrow a + b = \frac{n}{2^{I-1}} + \epsilon, \quad \text{where } 0 < \epsilon < n/2^{M+1} < 2. \quad (4.7b)$$

The case $I = 1$ is identical ($\{2^i b\}$ is independent of b_1 , for $i \geq 1$). Define $I' > 1$ to be the smallest index (other than $I = 1$) with $a_{I'} = 1$ or $b_{I'} = 1$. Again $I' - 1 \leq M$, because otherwise $n/2 < b < n/2 + 2$, impossible since b is odd. Then the identical argument gives

$$I = 1 \Rightarrow a + b = \frac{n}{2} + \frac{n}{2^{I'-1}} + \epsilon, \quad \text{where } 0 < \epsilon < 2 \quad (4.7c)$$

In both (4.7b, c), ϵ is fixed by the constraint that $a + b$ must be even. Thus we have essentially removed one degree of freedom. First we will constrain I, I' .

more natural, but probably can still be simplified. The basic idea is simple: we make 4 series of numbers coprime to n out of powers of 2; writing down the (4.1b) inequalities for these forces either $a=b=1$ or $n=18$. It is the intricate and not very interesting details which make this argument so long.

Claim 6. $I \neq 2$. If $I = 1$ then $3 \leq I' < M$ (unless $n = 18$), and

$$\{ab\} + \{b^2\} = n + 2, \quad \{a^2\} = 1. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. Suppose first that $I = 2$. Then $a + b = n/2 + 1$, by (4.7b). From this, we can compute $a^2, ab, b^2 \pmod n$: $ab \equiv (a+b)^2 - a^2 - b^2 \equiv n/2 - 2$; $a^2 \equiv (a+b)a - ab \equiv a + 2$; $b^2 \equiv (a+b)b - ab \equiv b + 2$. $a^2 \equiv a + 2$ tells us either $\frac{a(a-1)}{2} \equiv 1 \pmod n$ (if $a \equiv -1 \pmod 4$), or $\frac{a(a-1)}{2} + \frac{1}{2}n \equiv 1 \pmod n$ (if $a \equiv +1 \pmod 4$). Then $a \equiv +1 \pmod 4$ would violate (4.1b) with $\ell = \frac{a-1}{2} + \frac{n}{2}$ (for then $\{\ell a\} = 1$; $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_n$ because we have learned $\frac{a-1}{2} \in \mathcal{C}_{n/2}$), so $a \equiv -1 \pmod 4$. Similarly, we must have $b \equiv -1 \pmod 4$, so $\frac{n}{2} + 1 = a + b \equiv 2 \pmod 4$, i.e. $n \equiv 2 \pmod 8$. Now take $\ell = \frac{n+2}{4}$; $a, b < n/2$ so we get $\{\ell a\} + \{\ell b\} = \{\frac{-n}{4} + \frac{a}{2}\} + \{\frac{-n}{4} + \frac{b}{2}\} = \frac{3n}{2} + \frac{n+2}{4} > n$, contradicting (4.1b).

Now suppose $I = 1$. Then by (4.7c), $I' = 2$ would violate $a + b < n$. $I = 1$ means $b > n/2$, so (4.1b) gives $\{ab\} + \{b^2\} > n$. But by (4.6), and the fact that both $\{ab\}$ and $\{b^2\}$ must be odd, we get (4.8).

If $I' \geq M$, then $a < n/2^{I'-1} \leq n/2^{M-1} < 8$, and $n/2 < b < n/2 + 8$, which give us the possibilities $a = 1, 3, 5$, or 7 , and $b = n/2 + 2, n/2 + 4$, or $n/2 + 6$. But for $a = 3, 5, 7$ respectively, the condition $\{a^2\} = 1$ means n must divide $8, 24$, and 48 . $(a, b) = (1, n/2 + 2)$ means $2 \equiv ab + b^2 \equiv n/2 + 2 + n/2 + 4 \pmod n$, i.e. n divides 4 . $(a, b) = (1, n/2 + 4)$ means $2 \equiv n/2 + 4 + n/2 + 16 \pmod n$, i.e. n divides 18 . $(a, b) = (1, n/2 + 6)$ means $2 \equiv n/2 + 6 + n/2 + 36 \pmod n$, i.e. n divides 40 .

But $n > 3$ and $n \equiv 2 \pmod 4$, so the n which must be explicitly checked are $n = 6, 10, 18$. QED to Claim 6

Now that we know so much about a, b and $a + b$, a similar game can be played with them. In particular, define $\ell'_i = \{n/2 + 2^i a\}$, $\ell''_i = \{n/2 + 2^i b\}$, and $\ell'''_j = \{n/2 + 2^j(a + b)\}$. Note that from Claim 5 these lie in $\mathcal{C}_n$ for $i \geq 1$ and $j \geq 0$.

Define the binary digits $(a^2)_i, (ab)_i, (b^2)_i, (a^2 + ab)_i$ and $(ab + b^2)_i$, by $\{a^2\}/n = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (a^2)_i 2^{-i}$, etc. Then the identical calculation which led to (4.7a) gives us

$$\{\ell'_i a\} + \{\ell'_i b\} = \{2^i a^2\} + \{2^i ab\} + \begin{cases} n & \text{if } (a^2)_{i+1} = (ab)_{i+1} = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } (a^2)_{i+1} + (ab)_{i+1} = 1 \\ -n & \text{if } (a^2)_{i+1} = (ab)_{i+1} = 1 \end{cases}; \quad (4.9)$$

with similar expressions for ℓ''_i and ℓ'''_j (for ℓ''_i , replace a^2 and ab in (4.9) with ab and b^2 ; for ℓ'''_j replace them with $a^2 + ab$ and $ab + b^2$). Moreover, when $I > 1$, we know $a_i = 0 = b_i$ for $1 \leq i < I$, and $a_i + b_i = 1$ for $I \leq i \leq M + 1$; also (4.7b) tells us $(a + b)_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq M + 1$, except $(a + b)_{I-1} = 1$. This means: $\ell'_i, \ell''_i > n/2$ for $1 \leq i \leq I - 2$; for each $I - 1 \leq i \leq M$ either $\ell'_i < n/2 < \ell''_i$ or $\ell''_i < n/2 < \ell'_i$; for $0 \leq j \leq M$, $\ell'''_j > n/2$, except for $\ell'''_{I-2} < n/2$. From (4.1b), these inequalities tell us how the quantities like (4.9) compare to n , for all $1 \leq i \leq M$ and $0 \leq j \leq M$.

For $I = 1$, the identical inequalities hold for ℓ'_i, ℓ''_i , except with I there replaced with I' here. The same applies to ℓ'''_j , except for the additional change that $\ell'''_0 < n/2$.

Consider now $I \geq 3$. Since $a < n/2$, we have $\{a^2 + ab\} = \{a^2\} + \{ab\}$; since $b < n/2$ we have $\{ab + b^2\} = \{ab\} + \{b^2\}$. Note that induction on i gives us

$$(a^2 + ab)_i + (ab + b^2)_i = 1 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq I - 2 \quad (4.10a)$$

(both equal to 0 would contradict $\{a^2 + ab\} + \{ab + b^2\} = n + 3 + \{ab\} > n$; both 1 would contradict (4.1b) with ℓ'''_{i-1}). Then (4.1b) with ℓ'''_{I-2} forces

$$(a^2 + ab)_{I-1} = (ab + b^2)_{I-1} = 1, \quad (4.10b)$$

because the alternative, namely $(a^2 + ab)_{I-1} + (ab + b^2)_{I-1} = 1$, leads to

$$n > \{2^{I-2}(a^2 + ab)\} + \{2^{I-2}(ab + b^2)\} = 2\{2^{I-3}(a^2 + ab)\} - n + 2\{2^{I-3}(ab + b^2)\} > 2n - n = n, \quad (4.10c)$$

a contradiction (the first inequality is the ℓ'''_{I-2} condition, the second is ℓ'''_{I-3}). And now, by the identical argument which gave us (4.7a), we find that there exists an $I_0 \geq I$ such that

$$n + 3 + \{ab\} = \{a^2 + ab\} + \{ab + b^2\} = n + \frac{n}{2^{I_0-1}} + \epsilon, \quad 0 < \epsilon < \frac{n}{2^{M+1}} < 2. \quad (4.10d)$$

(I_0 is the first index $\geq I$ such that $(a^2 + ab)_{I_0} + (ab + b^2)_{I_0} \geq 1 - I_0 \leq M + 1$ since otherwise $n + 3 < \{a^2 + ab\} + \{ab + b^2\} < n + \frac{n}{2^{M+1}} + \frac{n}{2^{M+1}} < n + 4$, an impossibility.)

We can now fix I . To do this, note that the ℓ'_i conditions tell us that either

$$\{a^2\} + \{ab\} = \frac{n}{2^{I_1-1}} + \epsilon' \quad \text{for } 0 < \epsilon' < \frac{n}{2^{I-1}}, \quad (4.11a)$$

$$\text{or } \{a^2\} + \{ab\} = \frac{n}{2} + \frac{n}{2^{I_1-1}} + \epsilon' \quad \text{for } 0 < \epsilon' < \frac{n}{2^{I-1}}, \quad (4.11b)$$

for some $I_1 > 1$ in (4.11a) and $I_1 > 2$ in (4.11b) (if $(a^2)_i + (ab)_i \geq 1$ for some $1 < i \leq I - 1$, the derivation is identical to that of (4.7), using ℓ'_i in place of ℓ_i ; otherwise $\{a^2\}, \{ab\} < n/2^{I-1}$, so (4.11) will be satisfied for some $I_1 \geq I$). The identical expressions apply to $\{ab\} + \{b^2\}$, of course, using ℓ''_i – call its parameters I_2 and ϵ'' . But according to (4.11), (4.10b) can be satisfied iff $I_1 = I = I_2$. But then (4.11) says (4.10a) can be satisfied iff there are no i between 1 and $I - 1$ – i.e. $I = 3$.

So $I = 3$ is forced. (4.7a) then reads $a + b = n/4 + \epsilon'''$, where $0 < \epsilon''' < 2$ is fixed by $a + b$ being even. From $3 + \{ab\} \equiv (a + b)^2 \pmod{n}$ we get

$$3 + \{ab\} = \begin{cases} (7n + 18)/8 & \text{if } n \equiv 2 \pmod{16} \\ (5n + 2)/8 & \text{if } n \equiv 6 \pmod{16} \\ (3n + 18)/8 & \text{if } n \equiv 10 \pmod{16} \\ (n + 2)/8 & \text{if } n \equiv 14 \pmod{16} \end{cases}. \quad (4.12)$$

(4.10d) is compatible with (4.12) only if $n \equiv 14$. In this case we can compute $\{b^2\}$ as we did in Claim 6, and we find $\{b^2\} = \frac{1}{8}n + \frac{b}{2} + \frac{11}{4}$ (if $b \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$) or $\frac{5}{8}n + \frac{b}{2} + \frac{11}{4}$ (if $b \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$). In either case (at least for $n > 14$), taking ℓ''_2 gives us $n - 11 + 2b + 11 > n$, which contradicts (4.1b) ($I = 3$ here, so $\ell''_2 < n/2$).

Finally, consider the remaining possibility: $I = 1$ and $M > I' \geq 3$. $\ell'''_0 < n/2$, but $(ab + b^2)_1 = 0$ by (4.8), so $(1 + ab)_1 = 1$, i.e. $\{ab\} + 1 > n/2$, so $\{ab\} \geq n/2 + 2$ (it must be odd, and coprime to n).

Define $J > 1$ by $n/2 + n/2^J < \{ab\} < n/2 + n/2^{J-1}$, and suppose for contradiction that $J < I'$. Then as in the (4.7b) derivation (with ℓ'_i in place of ℓ_i) we get $1 + \{ab\} = n/2 + n/2^{J-1} + \epsilon$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$. That is, $(a^2 + ab)_i = 0$ for all $i \leq M + 1$, except for $i = 1$ and $i = J - 1$. But by (4.8), $(ab + b^2)_i = 0$ for all $i \leq M$. Now, $\ell'''_{I'-2} < n/2$ produces a contradiction in (4.1b): $(a^2 + ab)_{I'-1} = 0 = (ab + b^2)_{I'-1}$, since $J < I'$ by hypothesis.

Thus $I' \leq J$. If we had $\{b^2\} > n/2$, then this would give us $n + 2 = \{ab\} + \{b^2\} > n/2 + 2 + n/2 = n + 2$, a contradiction.

Therefore $(b^2)_1 = 0$. As in (4.10a), the constraints $\{ab\} + \{b^2\} > n$ and (4.1b) with ℓ''_{i-1} tell us $(ab)_i + (b^2)_i = 1$ for $i = 2, \dots, I' - 1$. As in (4.10b), we also get $(ab)_{I'} = (b^2)_{I'} = 1$. Now $n + 2 = \{ab\} + \{b^2\}$ implies $(ab)_i = (b^2)_i = 0$ for $I' < i \leq M$. Also, $(a^2)_i = 0$ for all $i \leq M + 1$. But either $\ell'_{I'}$ or $\ell''_{I'}$ will be less than $n/2$ – whichever is will violate (4.1b). **QED** to Prop.1 for $n \equiv 2$.

Section 5. The simple-current chiral extension

In this section we use Thm.2 to find the possible values $M_{\rho\mu}, M_{\lambda\rho}$ for most k . We will find that except for four values of k considered in the next section, a physical invariant will either be a permutation invariant, or an automorphism of the *simple-current chiral extension*. The former are listed in Thm.1; the latter are given in Thm.3 below. This will complete the classification of $SU(3)_k$ for all $k \neq 5, 9, 21, 57$.

Claim 7. Let M be a level $k = n - 3$ physical invariant. Then for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$, $M_{\rho\lambda} = M_{\lambda\rho} \in \{0, 1\}$. $\mathcal{R}(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \mathcal{K}_R^\rho(M)$ will equal one of the following sets:

- (a) for $n \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{3}$, $n \neq 8$, $\mathcal{R}(M)$ will equal $\{\rho\}$;
- (b) for $n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, $n \neq 12, 24$, $\mathcal{R}(M)$ will equal either $\{\rho\}$ or $\mathcal{O}_0\rho = \{\rho, A\rho, A^2\rho\}$;
- (c) for $n = 8$, $\mathcal{R}(M)$ will either equal $\{\rho\}$ or $\{\rho, \rho'\}$, where $\rho' = (n/2 - 1, n/2 - 1)$;
for $n = 12$, $\mathcal{R}(M)$ will either equal $\{\rho\}$, $\mathcal{O}_0\rho$, or $\mathcal{O}_0\rho \cup \mathcal{O}_0\rho'$;
for $n = 24$, $\mathcal{R}(M)$ will either equal $\{\rho\}$, $\mathcal{O}_0\rho$, or $\mathcal{O}_0\rho \cup \mathcal{O}_0\rho' \cup \mathcal{O}_0\rho'' \cup \mathcal{O}_0\rho'''$, where $\rho'' = (5, 5)$ and $\rho''' = (7, 7)$.

Proof for $n \neq 8, 12, 24, 60$ We will defer the proof of Claim 7 for the heights $n = 8, 12, 24, 60$ to the next section.

Claim 7 is automatic for $n \equiv 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 11 \pmod{12}$, by Thm.2 and (P3). For the other levels, we will show $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M)$ must equal one of the given possibilities, and also that each $M_{\lambda\rho} \in \{0, 1\}$. By symmetry the same comments apply to $\mathcal{K}_R^\rho(M)$ and $M_{\rho\lambda}$, so $M_{\rho\lambda} = M_{\lambda\rho}$ and $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \mathcal{K}_R^\rho(M)$ follow from Lemma 1(d).

Consider $n \equiv 4, 8 \pmod{12}$. Thm.2 tells us $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho \subseteq \{\rho, \rho'\}$. $\rho = \rho'$ for $n = 4$, so we may assume $n > 8$ here. We may assume $1 \leq m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M_{\rho'\rho}$ (otherwise $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \{\rho\}$ and we are done). Then (see Lemma 1(a))

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq s_L^{(1,2)}(M) = S_{(1,2),\rho}^{(n)} \cdot 1 + S_{(1,2),\rho'}^{(n)} \cdot m \\
&= \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}n} \{ (1+m) \sin[2\pi/n] + (1-m) \sin[4\pi/n] - (1+m) \sin[6\pi/n] \} \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}n} (1+m) \{ \sin[2\pi/n] - \sin[6\pi/n] \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

For $n > 8$, the RHS of (5.1) is negative. Therefore, for $n > 8$ $M_{\rho'\rho} = 0$ so $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \{\rho\}$.

Now suppose $n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, and $\{\rho\} \neq \mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_0\rho$. Then Lemma 1(b) says $M_{A\rho,\rho} \neq 0$ iff $M_{A^2\rho,\rho} \neq 0$, so both must be non-zero. Lemma 1(c) now tells us $1 = M_{\rho\rho} = M_{A\rho,\rho} = M_{A^2\rho,\rho}$, so $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \mathcal{O}_0\rho$.

All that remains is $n \equiv 0 \pmod{12}$, where Thm.2 tells us $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_0\rho \cup \mathcal{O}_0\rho'$. Define $m = \sum_{i=0}^2 M_{A^i\rho,\rho}$, and $m' = \sum_{i=0}^2 M_{A^i\rho',\rho}$ – we may suppose $m' \geq 1$ (otherwise $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_0\rho$, which was done in the previous paragraph). We will first prove that $m \leq m'$. There are two cases to consider: by Lemma 1(b) either $\mathcal{J}_L = \{A^0\}$ or $\{A^0, A, A^2\}$. In the first case $m = 1$ by (P3), so by supposition $m \leq m'$. For the second case, Lemma 1(c) tells us $m = 3M_{\rho\rho} = 3$ and $m' = 3M_{\rho'\rho} \geq 3$, so again $m \leq m'$.

Then, by Lemma 1(a) again and by (1.6d), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq s_L^{(1,4)}(M) = S_{(1,4),\rho}^{(n)} \cdot m + S_{(1,4),\rho'}^{(n)} \cdot m' \\ &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}n} \{ (m + m') \sin[2\pi/n] + (m - m') \sin[8\pi/n] - (m + m') \sin[10\pi/n] \} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}n} (m + m') \{ \sin[2\pi/n] - \sin[10\pi/n] \}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

But the RHS of (5.2) will be negative unless $n = 12$. QED

When $\mathcal{R}(M) = \{\rho\}$, Lemma 2 tells us M will be listed in Thm.1. We will handle the anomolous ρ -couplings of $n = 8, 12, 24$, or 60 in Sect.6; here we consider $n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ and $\mathcal{R}(M) = \mathcal{O}_0\rho$ – this corresponds to a simple-current chiral extension. But first let us review what we know.

Recall the definition of *triality*: $t(\lambda) \equiv \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \pmod{3}$. Let $\mathcal{P}_0$ denote the set of all weights $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$ with $t(\lambda) \equiv 0$, and let $\mathcal{P}_\square = \mathcal{P}_0/\mathcal{O}_0$ be the set of all orbits $[\lambda] = \mathcal{O}_0\lambda \subset \mathcal{P}_0$. Lemma 1(e) tells us $\mathcal{P}_L(M) = \mathcal{P}_R(M) = \mathcal{P}_0$. Note that there is only one ‘fixed point’ of $\mathcal{O}_0$, namely $f = (n/3, n/3)$. Lemma 3(c) defines a mapping σ with a domain and range contained in $\mathcal{P}_\square \sim \{f\}$, with the property that when $\lambda, \mu \neq f$, then $M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$ iff $M_{\lambda\sigma} = 1$ iff $[\mu] = \sigma[\lambda]$. So we already know a considerable amount about M . All that remains is to understand what M looks like at the fixed point f , and then to find σ . Write σ' for the inverse of σ . That f can cause complications is apparent by looking at the exceptional $\mathcal{E}_9^{(2)}$.

Theorem 3. Suppose $\mathcal{R}(M) = \mathcal{O}_0\rho$. Then M is either the *simple-current invariant* $\mathcal{D}_k$ given in eq.(1.7c), its conjugation $\mathcal{D}_k^c$, the exceptional $\mathcal{E}_9^{(2)}$ given in (1.7f), or its conjugation $\mathcal{E}_9^{(2)c}$.

Proof **Step 1** We begin by investigating $M_{f\lambda}, M_{\lambda f}$.

Look at the decompositions $\oplus_i B_i$ of MM^T , and $\oplus_j B'_j$ of $M^T M$ (see (2.4a)), where B_1, B'_1 ‘contain’ ρ , and B_ℓ, B'_ℓ ‘contain’ f . Now, $B_1 = B'_1 = B_{(3,3)}$ (see (2.4d)), so by Lemma 3(b) $r(B_\ell) = r(B'_\ell) = 9$. One thing this means is (see (2.4c))

$$(B_\ell)_{ff} = \sum_{\mu} M_{f\mu}^2 = M_{ff}^2 + 3 \sum_{[\mu] \neq [f]} M_{f\mu}^2 \leq 9, \quad (5.3a)$$

$$(B'_\ell)_{ff} = \sum_{\lambda} M_{\lambda f}^2 = M_{ff}^2 + 3 \sum_{[\lambda] \neq [f]} M_{\lambda f}^2 \leq 9, \quad (5.3b)$$

with equality in (5.3a) iff B_ℓ is 1×1 , and with equality in (5.3b) iff B'_ℓ is 1×1 . Let $[\lambda^1], [\lambda^2], \dots$ denote the different orbits $[\lambda] \subset \mathcal{K}_L^f(M) \sim \{f\}$, and $[\mu^1], [\mu^2], \dots \subset \mathcal{K}_R^f(M) \sim \{f\}$. From (5.3) we read off that $M_{\lambda^i f} = 1 = M_{f \mu^j}$ for all i, j . We also see that there are precisely six possibilities for $\mathcal{K}_L^f(M)$ (similarly for $\mathcal{K}_R^f(M)$): $\mathcal{K}_L^f(M)$ will equal either $[f]$, $[\lambda^1]$, $[f] \cup [\lambda^1]$, $[\lambda^1] \cup [\lambda^2]$, $[f] \cup [\lambda^1] \cup [\lambda^2]$, and $[\lambda^1] \cup [\lambda^2] \cup [\lambda^3]$. Each $\lambda^i \neq f$, and lie on distinct orbits. Call these cases 10, 01, 11, 02, 12, and 03, respectively.

To begin note that $\mathcal{K}_L^f(M)$ and $\mathcal{K}_R^f(M)$ are always of equal *case* (though *a priori* they could be unequal as sets). To see this, let their cases be ab and cd , respectively, where $a, c = 0, 1$ and $b, d = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Now, $a = c$ because $a = 0$ iff $M_{ff} = 0$ iff $c = 0$. Also, $b = d$ because the cardinality of the domain of σ , namely $(n-1)(n-2)/2 - 3b - 1$, must equal the cardinality of the domain of σ' , namely $(n-1)(n-2)/2 - 3d - 1$.

Case 10: Note that B_ℓ is 1×1 . Therefore equality must hold in (5.3a), which for case 10 requires $M_{f\lambda} = M_{\lambda f} = 3\delta_{\lambda f}$.

Case 0b, $b = 1, 2, 3$: Note that for any case 0b, B_ℓ will be 1×1 . Therefore we must have $9 = 3b$, since $M_{f\mu^i} = 1$. This means that of these, only case 03 works.

Case 11: The question here is, what can M_{ff} equal? Eq.(5.3a) demands it be 1 or 2. Note that

$$B_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} M_{ff}^2 + 3 & M_{ff} \\ M_{ff} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.3c)$$

again using the fact that $M_{f\mu^1} = M_{\lambda^1 f} = 1$. This must have $r(B_\ell) = 9$; we find that this requires $M_{ff} = 2$.

Case 12: The same reasoning as used in case 11 applies here. We find that $M_{ff} = 1$ is forced here.

Step 2 Now, look at the commutation relations that σ and λ^i must satisfy. First, choosing $\mu \notin \mathcal{K}_R^f(M)$, and any $\lambda^i \neq f$ lying in $\mathcal{K}_L^f(M)$, we get

$$S_{f\mu}^{(n)} = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}^k} M_{\lambda^i \nu} S_{\nu \mu}^{(n)} = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}^k} S_{\lambda^i \nu}^{(n)} M_{\nu \mu} = 3S_{\lambda^i, \sigma' \mu}^{(n)}, \quad (5.4a)$$

where by “ $\sigma' \mu$ ” in (5.4a) we mean any element of $\sigma'[\mu]$ – because $\lambda^i \in \mathcal{P}_0$ (1.6d) tells us the RHS of (5.4a) is unaffected by this choice.

We may assume $n > 6$ (for $n = 6$, (2.1c) alone is enough to force the partition function to be $\mathcal{D}_3 = \mathcal{D}_3^c$). Thus $(2, 2) \neq f$. Now $(2, 2) \in \mathcal{K}_L^f(M)$ only if $3S_{(2,2), \rho}^{(n)} = S_{f\rho}^{(n)}$ using (5.4a), *i.e.* only if

$$\sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{4\pi}{n}\right) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{8}, \quad (5.4b)$$

using (2.1a). But the LHS is a strictly decreasing function of $n \geq 9$, so equality there can only happen for one value of n . It turns out $n = 12$ is this value. Therefore, for $n \neq 12$, $(2, 2) \notin \mathcal{K}_L^f(M)$ and $(2, 2) \notin \mathcal{K}_R^f(M)$.

We would like to show that in fact $\sigma[(2, 2)] = [(2, 2)]$. If n is odd, we get that easily: $2 \in \mathcal{C}_{3n}$ so Lemma 4(a) tells us $1 = M_{11,11} = M_{22,22}$. For n even, write $\sigma[(2, 2)] = [(a, b)]$ – we may choose $a \leq b \leq n - a - a$. $(MS)_{22, \rho} = (SM)_{22, \rho}$ gives us

$$\sin\left(\frac{a\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{b\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{(a+b)\pi}{n}\right) = \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{4\pi}{n}\right). \quad (5.4c)$$

Then the LHS of (5.4c) will be larger than the RHS, unless either $a = b = 2$, or $a = 1$, or $n - a - b < 4$. The latter possibility requires $a = b = 3$ and $n = 9$, *i.e.* $(2, 2) \in \mathcal{K}_L^f(M)$, which was ruled out already. $a = 1$ fails (2.1c), for n even: $1 + b + b^2$ is odd, but $4 + 4 + 4$ is even, so they cannot be equal (mod $3n$). Thus for all n (except possibly $n = 12$), we have $\sigma[(2, 2)] = [(2, 2)]$.

Step 3 Suppose for contradiction that $\lambda^i \in \mathcal{K}_L^f(M)$ for some $\lambda^i \neq f$. Write $\lambda^i = (a, b)$. Then (5.4a) with $\mu = \rho$ and $\mu = (2, 2)$, respectively, tells us

$$\sin\left(\frac{a\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{b\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{(a+b)\pi}{n}\right) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{8}, \quad (5.5a)$$

$$\sin\left(\frac{2a\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2b\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2(a+b)\pi}{n}\right) = \frac{-\sqrt{3}}{8}. \quad (5.5b)$$

Dividing these equations gives

$$\cos\left(\frac{a\pi}{n}\right) \cos\left(\frac{b\pi}{n}\right) \cos\left(\frac{(a+b)\pi}{n}\right) = \frac{-1}{8}. \quad (5.5c)$$

We claim that in the interval $0 < a, b, a + b < n$, the LHS of (5.5c) has a global minimum of $-1/8$, and it achieves that only at $a = b = n/3$. This can be trivially proved by differentiating: the derivative with respect to a is proportional to $\cos(b\pi/n) \{\sin(a\pi/n) \cos((a+b)\pi/n) + \cos(a\pi/n) \sin((a+b)\pi/n)\} = \cos(b\pi/n) \sin((2a+b)\pi/n)$, etc.

In other words, there is a *unique* solution to (5.5c): $a = b = n/3$. But this is not a solution to (5.5a). Therefore (5.5a, b) are incompatible, so no such λ^i can be found.

What we have shown is that whenever $(2, 2) \notin \mathcal{K}_L^f(M)$ (*e.g.* $n \neq 12$), then $\mathcal{K}_L^f(M) = \mathcal{K}_R^f(M) = [f]$, so $M_{f\lambda} = M_{\lambda f} = 3\delta_{\lambda f}$. Defining $\sigma[f] = [f]$ thus makes σ into a permutation of $\mathcal{P}_{\square}$.

Step 4 Choose any $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_0$. Expanding out $(S^{(n)}M)_{\lambda\mu} = (MS^{(n)})_{\lambda\mu}$ gives us $3S_{\lambda, \sigma'\mu}^{(n)} = 3S_{\sigma\lambda, \mu}^{(n)}$, *i.e.*

$$S_{\lambda\mu}^{(n)} = S_{\sigma\lambda, \sigma\mu}^{(n)}. \quad (5.6)$$

So σ is very much like a permutation invariant, and we can hope the argument in Sect.3 carries over with minimal change. To some extent this is true, but we must be careful here because σ is only defined on $\mathcal{P}_{\square}$ – the σ of a true permutation invariant would act on $\mathcal{P}^k$.

In Sect.3 we look at $N_{\lambda\lambda\lambda}^{(n)}$. This doesn't work as well here (see eq.(5.10) in [9]). Instead, we will use $N_{\lambda ff}^{(n)}$. From (3.3) we compute:

$$N_{\lambda ff}^{(n)} = \begin{cases} \min\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, n - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2\} & \text{if } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (5.7a)$$

Now, from Verlinde's formula (3.2a), and eq.(5.6), and the fact that $S_{\mu f}^{(n)} = 0$ if $\mu \notin \mathcal{P}_0$ (this follows from (1.6d) and $S_{\mu f}^{(n)} = S_{\mu, Af}^{(n)}$), we see that $N_{\lambda ff}^{(n)} = N_{\sigma\lambda, ff}^{(n)} \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_0$. Thus

$$\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, n - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2\} \cap \{(\sigma\lambda)_1, (\sigma\lambda)_2, n - (\sigma\lambda)_1 - (\sigma\lambda)_2\} \neq \{\}. \quad (5.7b)$$

(5.6) also gives us $S_{\rho\lambda}^{(n)} = S_{\rho,\sigma\lambda}^{(n)}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_0$. Therefore Claim 1 applies, and we get

$$\sigma[\lambda] = [\lambda] \quad \text{or} \quad [C\lambda], \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_0. \quad (5.7c)$$

Claim 8. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$, $S_{(1,4),\lambda}^{(n)} = S_{(1,4),C\lambda}^{(n)}$ iff $[\lambda] = [C\lambda]$.

Proof The proof is very similar to that of Claim 2. Suppose first that $S_{14,1a}^{(n)} = S_{14,1a}^{(n)*}$ (as in Claim 2 we need not limit ourselves to integral $n = k + 3$ or a). Then we get

$$\tilde{c}_n(3a + 2) + \tilde{c}_n(2a - 1) + \tilde{c}_n(a + 3) = \tilde{c}_n(2a + 3) + \tilde{c}_n(a - 2) + \tilde{c}_n(3a + 1), \quad (5.8a)$$

where $\tilde{c}_n(x) = \cos(2\pi x/n)$. Putting $b = a + \frac{1}{2}$ we get

$$\tilde{p}(b, n) = \tilde{c}_n(3b + \frac{1}{2}) + \tilde{c}_n(2b - 2) + \tilde{c}_n(b + \frac{5}{2}) - \tilde{c}_n(3b - \frac{1}{2}) - \tilde{c}_n(2b + 2) - \tilde{c}_n(b - \frac{5}{2}). \quad (5.8b)$$

Then as before $\tilde{p}(b, n) = \tilde{s}_n(b) p_2^{(n)}(\tilde{c}_n(b))$, where $p_2^{(n)}$ is a quadratic polynomial. Thus $\tilde{p}(b, n)$ will have at most 2+2 zeroes (2 from $\tilde{s}_n$, and ≤ 2 from $p_2^{(n)}$) in the range $0 \leq b \leq n/2$. But $b = 0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{n}{2}$ are clearly zeroes. Therefore as long as $n \geq 3$, there are no solutions a to $S_{14,1a}^{(n)} = S_{14,1a}^{(n)*}$ in the range $1 < a < \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$.

Now choose any $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^k$. Then $\exists \lambda' \in \mathcal{O}\lambda$ such that $\lambda'_1 \leq \lambda'_2 \leq n - \lambda'_1 - \lambda'_2$. Put $a = \lambda'_2/\lambda'_1$, $n' = n/\lambda'_1$, so $1 \leq a \leq \frac{n'}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$ and $n' \geq 3$. We find that $S_{14,\lambda}^{(n)} = S_{14,\lambda}^{(n)*}$ iff $S_{14,\lambda'}^{(n)} = S_{14,\lambda'}^{(n)*}$ iff $S_{14,1a}^{(n')} = S_{14,1a}^{(n')*}$ iff $a = 1$ or $a = \frac{n'}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$. $a = 1$ corresponds to $\lambda'_1 = \lambda'_2$, i.e. $C\lambda' = \lambda'$. $a = \frac{n'}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$ corresponds to $\lambda'_2 = n - \lambda'_1 - \lambda'_2$, i.e. $CA^2\lambda' = A^2\lambda'$. QED

The conclusion to the proof of Thm.3 is as in Sect.3. From (5.7c) we may assume, by conjugating if necessary, that $\sigma[(1, 4)] = [(1, 4)]$. Suppose $\sigma[\lambda] = [C\lambda]$ for some $[\lambda] \in \mathcal{P}_{\square}$. Then (5.6) tells us $S_{(1,4),\lambda}^{(n)} = S_{(1,4),C\lambda}^{(n)}$, so by Claim 8 $[\lambda] = [C\lambda]$. Therefore $\sigma[\lambda] = [\lambda]$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_0$, so M is the invariant $\mathcal{D}_k$. QED to Thm.3

Section 6. The exceptional levels

The analysis in the last section avoided four heights: $n = 8, 12, 24$ and 60 . There are various ways we can handle these. One way is the lattice method, employed in [11]. But this is a bit of overkill: that method finds much more than just the physical invariants. The consequence is that, for higher levels (or higher ranks), the lattice method becomes unfeasible. E.g. it has never been worked out for $n = 60$.

The methods developed in this paper however work for these exceptional levels – they merely require a bit more effort. That will be the task in this section: to complete the $SU(3)_k$ classification for these four levels. The first thing to do is to complete the proof of Claim 7 for these levels.

Proof of Claim 7 for $n = 8, 12, 24, 60$ First consider $n = 8$. Again put $m = M_{\rho',\rho}$. Then as in (5.1) we get

$$0 \leq s_L^{(1,2)}(M) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}n}(1 - m). \quad (6.1a)$$

Therefore either $m = 0$ or $m = 1$ (i.e. $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \{\rho\}$ or $\{\rho, \rho'\}$, respectively).

Next consider $n = 12$. Again put $m = \sum_{i=0}^2 M_{A^i \rho, \rho}$ and $m' = \sum_{i=0}^2 M_{A^i \rho', \rho}$. $m' = 0$ was done in Sect.5, so consider here $m' > 0$. Then as before, $m' \geq m$ and $m = 1$ or 3 . Eq.(5.2) becomes

$$0 \leq s_L^{(1,4)}(M) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}n}(m - m')\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right). \quad (6.1b)$$

Therefore $m' = m = 1$ or 3 . If $m = 3$ then $M_{\lambda\rho} = 0$ or 1 for all λ , by Lemma 1(c), and $\mathcal{K}_L^\rho(M) = \mathcal{O}_0\rho \cup \mathcal{O}_0\rho'$. But if $m = 1$, only one $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_0\rho'$, say $\lambda = A^\ell\rho'$, has $M_{\lambda\rho} \neq 0$. Then we have $M_{A^i \rho', \rho} = \delta_{i\ell}$. To show this is impossible look now at $s_L^{(1,2)}(M)$: depending on the value of ℓ this will either be non-real ($\ell = 1, 2$) or negative ($\ell = 0$).

Now consider the more difficult case $n = 24$. Write $\rho'' = (5, 5)$, $\rho''' = (7, 7)$, $m = \sum_{i=0}^2 M_{A^i \rho, \rho}$, $\dots$, $m''' = \sum_{i=0}^2 M_{A^i \rho''', \rho}$. We may restrict ourselves to the case where $m'' > 0$ or $m''' > 0$, since $m'' = m''' = 0$ was done in Sect.5. As usual, $m = 1$ or 3 , and either $m' = 0$ or $m' \geq m$, either $m'' = 0$ or $m'' \geq m$, and either $m''' = 0$ or $m''' \geq m$. Write $s(x)$ here for $\sin(\pi x/12)$. Then $s_L^{(2,2)}(M)$, $s_L^{(3,3)}(M)$ and $s_L^{(4,4)}(M)$ give us

$$0 \leq 2(m - m' + m'' - m''')s(2) - (m - m' - m'' + m''')s(4), \quad (6.2a)$$

$$0 \leq 2(m + m' - m'' - m''')s(3) - (m - m' + m'' - m''')s(6), \quad (6.2b)$$

$$0 \leq 2(m - m' - m'' + m''')s(4) - (m - m' - m'' + m''')s(8), \quad (6.2c)$$

respectively. These give us

$$0 \leq m - m' - m'' + m''', \quad (6.3a)$$

$$0 \leq m - m' + m'' - m''', \quad (6.3b)$$

$$0 \leq m + m' - m'' - m'''. \quad (6.3c)$$

In particular, (6.3a) comes immediately from (6.2c); (6.3b) comes from (6.2a) and (6.3a); and (6.3c) comes from (6.2b) and (6.3b).

Now adding eqs.(6.3a, b), eqs.(6.3a, c), and eqs.(6.3b, c) give us $m' \leq m$, $m'' \leq m$, and $m''' \leq m$. So each m', m'', m''' will either equal 0 or m . If $m'' = m$, then (6.2b) tells us $m' = m''' = m$; if $m''' = m$, then (6.2a) tells us $m' = m'' = m$. Thus $m = m' = m'' = m''' = 1$ or 3 .

As in the $n = 12$ case, $m = 3$ leads to the exceptional ρ -coupling given in Claim 7. If $m = 1$, there are numbers ℓ', ℓ'', ℓ''' such that $M_{A^i \rho', \rho} = \delta_{i\ell'}$, $M_{A^i \rho'', \rho} = \delta_{i\ell''}$, and $M_{A^i \rho''', \rho} = \delta_{i\ell'''}$. This leads to 27 possibilities, all of which fail the $s_L^{(3,2)}(M) \geq 0$ test, as can be easily checked on a computer.

Finally, consider $n = 60$. The reasoning and calculations are very similar to that for $n = 24$. Here, put $\rho'' = (11, 11)$, $\rho''' = (19, 19)$, and define m, m', m'', m''' as before. Looking at $s_L^{(3,3)}(M)$, $s_L^{(6,6)}(M)$ and $s_L^{(10,10)}(M)$ give us eqs.(6.3) again. As before, we can force $m = m' = m'' = m'''$ (use $s_L^{(3,3)}(M)$ and $s_L^{(5,5)}(M)$). But the difference here is that $s_L^{(2,5)}(M) < 0$, so neither $m = 1$ nor $m = 3$ work. QED to Claim 7

Our next task is to handle the remaining case of Thm.3: $n = 12$, so $f = (4, 4)$, and $M_{22,44} = 1$. First, on a computer we can find for each $\lambda = (a, b) \in \mathcal{P}_0$ all $\mu = (a', b') \in \mathcal{P}_0$ satisfying (2.1c) as well as the parity rule Lemma 4(b). We find any $\lambda, \mu \in [1, 1] \cup [5, 5]$ satisfy these two conditions, as do any $\lambda, \mu \in [2, 2] \cup [4, 4]$, $\lambda, \mu \in [3, 3]$, and $\lambda, \mu \in [1, 4] \cup [4, 1]$. This means $M_{\lambda f} \neq 0$ only if $\lambda \in [2, 2] \cup [f]$, so we find that M is “case 11” here (see Step 1 of the proof of Thm.3). Therefore $M_{ff} = 2$, and we know all values of $M_{\lambda f}, M_{f\lambda}$.

All we need to do is determine $\sigma[5, 5]$, $\sigma[3, 3]$, $\sigma[1, 4]$ and $\sigma[4, 1]$. Eq.(2.1c) and the parity rule tell us $\sigma[3, 3] = [3, 3]$. That $\sigma[5, 5] = [5, 5]$ can be seen by Lemma 4(a) with $\ell = 5$ applied to $M_{11,11}$. Now note that $M_{14,14} + M_{14,41} = 1$ (i.e. $\sigma[1, 4]$ equals either $[1, 4]$ or $[4, 1]$). Conjugating if necessary, we may assume $M_{14,14} = 1$. Then Lemma 4(a) with $\ell = 5$ tells us $M_{41,41} = 1$. This determines all unknown matrix elements $M_{\lambda\mu}$, and we find we have $M = \mathcal{E}_9^{(2)}$.

Finally, we must address the exceptional couplings listed in Claim 7. The idea is to use the various results we have to reduce the number of possible M to a small number which can then be checked on a computer for modular invariance. Together, Thms.1,3 and 4 complete the $SU(3)$ classification, for any level k .

Theorem 4. (i) For $n = 8$, if $\mathcal{R}(M) = \{\rho, \rho'\}$ then M either equals $\mathcal{E}_5$ or its conjugation.

(ii) For $n = 12$, if $\mathcal{R}(M) = \mathcal{O}_0(1, 1) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(3, 3)$ then $M = \mathcal{E}_9^{(1)}$.

(iii) For $n = 24$, if $\mathcal{R}(M) = \mathcal{O}_0(1, 1) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(5, 5) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(7, 7) \cup \mathcal{O}_0(11, 11)$ then $M = \mathcal{E}_{21}$.

Proof (i) We know from Claim 7 that $M_{\rho\lambda} = M_{\lambda\rho}$, for all λ , and that these all vanish except for $\lambda = (1, 1)$ and $\lambda = (3, 3)$, for which $M_{\rho\lambda} = M_{\lambda\rho} = 1$. Note that $(3\rho)^+ = (3, 3)$, and $(3(3, 3))^+ = \rho$. Therefore Lemma 4(a) with $\ell = 3$ applied to $M_{11,11} = 1$ gives us $M_{33,33} = 1$. Also, $M_{33,\mu} = M_{11,(3\mu)^+} = 0$ unless $\mu = \rho$ or $(3, 3)$ (same for $M_{\lambda,33}$). Thus, if we expand M as in (2.4a), with B_1 ‘containing’ ρ as usual, then $B_1 = B_{(1,2)}$, so Lemma 3(b) tells us $r(B_i) = 2$ for all i , and each $M_{\lambda\mu} \leq 2$. We have reduced the number of possibilities for M to a finite number, and with a bit more effort can reduce this number further.

Lemma 1(a) tells us that $\mathcal{P}_L(M) = \mathcal{P}_R(M) = [1, 1] \cup [3, 3] \cup \mathcal{O}[1, 3]$. Again, (2.1c) and Lemma 4(b) strongly restrict the possible couplings, and we find $M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$ only for $\lambda, \mu \in [1, 1] \cup [3, 3]$, or for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{O}[1, 3]$. The relation $S^{(n)}M = MS^{(n)}$ evaluated at $((6, 1), \rho)$ tells us that $M_{61,16} + M_{61,61} = M_{61,32} + M_{61,23} = 1$; wlog (by conjugating if necessary) we may suppose $M_{61,61} = 1$. Then the familiar calculation (see (2.3b))

$$1 = M_{A\rho, A\rho} = \sum_{\lambda, \mu} S_{\rho\lambda}^{(n)*} M_{\lambda\mu} S_{\mu\rho}^{(n)} \omega^{t(\mu) - t(\lambda)} \leq M_{\rho\rho} = 1 \quad (6.4)$$

tells us $t(\lambda) \equiv t(\mu) \pmod{3}$ whenever $M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$.

There is now a small number of possibilities for the remaining $M_{\lambda\mu}$. Each can be easily checked on a computer for modular invariance (it is more convenient to use here $SM = MS$ rather than $M = S^\dagger MS$).

(ii) This is easier. Lemma 1(a) says $\mathcal{P}_L(M) = \mathcal{P}_R(M) = [1, 1] \cup [3, 3] \cup [5, 5]$. (2.1c) and Lemma 4(b) tell us $M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$ implies $\lambda, \mu \in [1, 1] \cup [5, 5]$ or $\lambda, \mu \in [3, 3]$. $\mathcal{J}_L(M) = \mathcal{J}_R(M) = \mathcal{O}_0$, so Lemma 1(c) tells us the only independent parameters are $M_{11,11} = M_{11,55} = M_{55,11} = 1$, $M_{55,55}$ and $M_{33,33}$. $M_{55,55} = 1$ by Lemma 4(a) using $\ell = 5$ and $M_{11,11} = 1$, so

(using usual notation) $B_1 = B_{(1,6)}$. But $B_2 = B_{(M_{33,33},3)}$ so $3M_{33,33} = r(B_2) = r(B_1) = 6$, *i.e.* $M_{33,33} = 2$. We have derived $M = \mathcal{E}_9^{(1)}$.

(iii) $\mathcal{P}_L(M) = \mathcal{P}_R(M) = [1, 1] \cup [5, 5] \cup [7, 7] \cup [11, 11] \cup [5, 8] \cup [8, 5] \cup [1, 7] \cup [7, 1]$. (2.1c) tells us $M_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$ implies either $\lambda, \mu \in [1, 1] \cup [5, 5] \cup [7, 7] \cup [11, 11]$ or $\lambda, \mu \in [5, 8] \cup [8, 5] \cup [1, 7] \cup [7, 1]$. Lemma 4(a) applied to $\ell = 5, 7, 11$ and to $M_{11,11} = M_{11,55} = M_{11,77} = M_{11,1111} = 1$ tells us $M_{aa,bb} = 1$ for each choice $a, b = 1, 5, 7, 11$. Also, $\mathcal{J}_L(M) = \mathcal{J}_R(M) = \mathcal{O}_0$. Together with Lemma 1(c), we find that $B_1 = B_{1,12}$.

Note that from Lemmas 4(a) and 1(c), we can similarly deduce all the remaining values of $M_{\lambda\mu}$ once we know the four values $M_{58,58}, M_{58,85}, M_{58,17}, M_{58,71}$. In fact we find from Lemmas 4(a) and 1(c) that for each $\lambda \in [5, 8] \cup [8, 5] \cup [1, 7] \cup [7, 1]$, each row sum $\sum_{\mu} M_{\lambda\mu}$ is equal (*i.e.* independent of λ). Eq.(2.4b) then tells us these sums must equal $r(B_1) = 12$, so $M_{58,58} + M_{58,85} + M_{58,17} + M_{58,71} = 4$. The small number of possibilities can be checked on a computer for modular invariance. QED

Conclusion

In this paper we rewrote the classification in [9], paying attention to the four points mentioned in the abstract.

There have been additional modular invariant classifications since [9] was written. For example, the *simple-current invariants* have been classified [17]. Among other things, [10] completes the classification for $SU(2)_{k_1} \times SU(2)_{k_2}$, $\forall k_1, k_2$. All heterotic invariants of small rank are now known [12], as are many of the $c = 24$ meromorphic theories [23]. New classifications have recently been found [13] for diagonal GKO cosets corresponding to $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$. Most physical invariants are ‘obvious’ – *i.e.* either due to outer automorphisms of the affine algebra, or to conformal embeddings. But new exceptionals are always being found.

Future work along these lines include attempting to find all permutation invariants for $SU(N)_k$ [20], and the possible chiral algebras for *e.g.* $SU(2)_{k_1} \times \cdots \times SU(2)_{k_r}$ [25]. Both these will be very important accomplishments. My own interests in this area lie in pursuing classifications for $SU(N)_k$, say, for all ‘sufficiently large’ k – there are reasons for believing that many simplifications occur in the large k limit. In particular, I would like k (or n) to play a more ‘dynamic’ role in the arguments.

But isolated classifications can be rather sterile. The interesting thing is to see if they shed any new light on the subject, *e.g.* disclose new connections or possibilities involving other areas of math or physics. Indeed this seems to be the case with these modular invariant classifications. The most famous example is the A-D-E classification of the $SU(2)_k$ physical invariants [5]. This $SU(3)_k$ classification also hints of deep interconnections with other areas. Indeed [22] has discovered (apparently completely by accident! [20]) a fascinating connection involving Fermat curves [16]. For me personally, this is the main motivation to continue in this area: trying to understand a little better these mysteries.

There are many interconnections between modular invariants of different algebras and levels. This can be seen in this paper. For example when $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, the parity rule $\epsilon(\ell\lambda) = \epsilon(\ell\mu)$, $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_n$, for $SU(3)_{n-3}$ is intimately connected with that for $SU(2)_{n/2-2}$ and

$SU(3)_{n/2-3}$ – exactly how depends on the values of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu_1, \mu_2 \pmod{2}$. We saw the $\mu = \rho$ case of this in the proof of Prop.1. The ‘reason’ for these connections is that $\ell \in \mathcal{C}_n$ iff $\ell + n/2 \in \mathcal{C}_n$ for these n . It is natural to try to better understand and exploit these various interconnections.

Acknowledgements. A number of people supported me at various stages of [9], and this paper. I would particularly like to thank Patrick Roberts, who was my sounding board through this whole process and could have had his name on [9]. I also benefitted throughout from conversations with Quang Ho-Kim and C.S. Lam, and more recently with Antoine Coste, Claude Itzykson, Jean Lascoux, Philippe Ruelle, Yassen Stanev and Mark Walton. The generosity of the IHES is also greatly appreciated.

References

- [1] Altschuler, D., Lacki, J., Zaugg, Ph.: The affine Weyl group and modular invariant partition functions. *Phys. Lett.* **B205** 281-284 (1988)
- [2] Bauer, M., Itzykson, C.: Modular transformations of $SU(N)$ affine characters and their commutant. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **127** 617-636 (1990)
- [3] Bégin, L., Mathieu, P., Walton, M.: $\hat{su}(3)_k$ fusion coefficients. *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A7** 3255-3265 (1992)
- [4] Bernard, D.: String characters from Kac-Moody automorphisms. *Nucl. Phys.* **B288** 628-648 (1987)
- [5] Cappelli, A., Itzykson, C., Zuber, J.-B.: The A-D-E classification of $A_1^{(1)}$ and minimal conformal field theories. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **113** 1-26 (1987)
- [6] Christe, P., Ravanani, F.: $G_N \otimes G_L / G_{N+L}$ conformal field theories and their modular invariant partition functions. *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A4** 897-920 (1989)
- [7] Coste, A., Gannon, T.: Remarks on Galois symmetry in RCFT. *Phys. Lett.* **B323** 316-321 (1994)
- [8] Gannon, T.: WZW Commutants, Lattices, and Level-one Partition Functions. *Nucl. Phys.* **B396** 708-736 (1993)
- [9] Gannon, T.: The classification of affine $SU(3)$ modular invariant partition functions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **161** 233-264 (1994)
- [10] Gannon, T.: Towards a classification of $SU(2) \oplus \dots \oplus SU(2)$ modular invariant partition functions. IHES preprint P/94/21 (hep-th/9402074)
- [11] Gannon, T., Ho-Kim, Q.: The low level modular invariant partition functions of rank 2 algebras. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* (in press) (hep-th/9304106)
- [12] Gannon, T., Ho-Kim, Q.: The rank-four heterotic modular invariant partition functions. IHES preprint P/94/5 (hep-th/9402027)
- [13] Gannon, T., Walton, M.A.: On the classification of diagonal coset modular invariants. (in preparation)
- [14] Gantmacher, F.R.: The theory of matrices. Vol.II. New York: Chesea Publishing Co. 1964
- [15] Kač, V.G.: Infinite Dimensional Lie Algebras, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1990

- [16] Koblitz, N., Rohrlich, D.: Simple factors in the Jacobian of a Fermat curve. *Can. J. Math.* **XXX** 1183-1205 (1978)
- [17] Kreuzer, M., Schellekens, A.N.: Simple currents versus orbifolds with discrete torsion – a complete classification. *Nucl. Phys. B***411** (1994) 97-121
- [18] Moore, G., Seiberg, N.: Naturality in conformal field theory. *Nucl. Phys. B***313** 16-40 (1989)
- [19] Ruelle, Ph.: Automorphisms of the affine $SU(3)$ fusion rules. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **160** 475-492 (1994)
- [20] Ruelle, Ph. (private communications)
- [21] Ruelle, Ph., Thiran, E., Weyers, J.: Modular invariants for affine $SU(3)$ theories at prime heights. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **133** 305-322 (1990)
- [22] Ruelle, Ph., Thiran, E., Weyers, J.: Implications of an arithmetical symmetry of the commutant for modular invariants. *Nucl. Phys. B***402** 693-708 (1993)
- [23] Schellekens, A.N.: Meromorphic $c = 24$ conformal field theories. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **153** 159-185 (1993)
Montague, P.: Orbifold constructions and the classification of self-dual $c = 24$ conformal field theories. (hep-th/9403088)
- [24] Stanev, Y.: Classification of the local extensions of the $SU(3)$ chiral current algebra. Vienna preprint ESI 19 (May 1993)
- [25] Stanev, Y.: Classification of the local extensions of the $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ chiral current algebras. Vienna ESI preprint (April 1994).